THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT: FROM BELGRADE TO DELHI

V. BENEVOLENSKY

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

V. BENEVOLENSKY

THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT: FROM BELGRADE TO DELHI

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Ludmila Lezhneva*
Designed by *Alexander Salnikov*

В. Беневоленский

ДВИЖЕНИЕ НЕПРИСОЕДИНЕНИЯ:
ОТ БЕЛГРАДА ДО ДЕЛИ

На английском языке

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1985

English translation © Progress Publishers 1985

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Б $\frac{0803000000-459}{014(01)-85}$ 69—85

CONTENTS

Introduction 5

Chapter I THE ORIGINS OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

§ 1. The Evolution of Goals and Principles . 10

§ 2. The Founders of the Non-Aligned Movement 18

§ 3. The First Summit Conference 26

Chapter II MAJOR LANDMARKS

§ 1. The Second to Sixth Summit Conferences 32

§ 2. The Seventh Summit Conference . . . 64

Chapter III THE UNITY OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT: WHAT AND HOW AFFECTS IT

§ 1. Non-Alignment, Neutrality and "Equidistance" 76

§ 2. Problems of Stronger Unity 80

Chapter IV ENEMIES AND ALLIES

§ 1. The US and the Non-Aligned Nations 93

§ 2. The USSR and the Non-Aligned Movement 108

Conclusion 122

Notes 127

INTRODUCTION

The non-aligned movement, which now comprises about 100 independent states, plays an important role in world politics and the developing countries' struggle for national and social emancipation and a better life for millions of people who cast away the shackles of colonialism not so long ago. At present no imperialist power can disregard this movement as they tried to do so in the early 1960s. Gone is the time when, upon attaining political independence, a young state had often to turn to an imperialist power for patronage or to join an aggressive military pact. The present-day correlation of forces on the world scene makes it possible to pursue the policy of non-alignment with the military blocs and also an independent foreign policy.

After coming into existence in the early 1960s as a result of the successful national liberation struggle by the colonial and dependent peoples and as a reaction of young independent states to Western attempts to draw them into aggressive military blocs, the non-aligned movement emerged as an influential force in the struggle for easing international

tensions, for disarmament, peace, freedom and progress throughout the world. Suffice it to recall that the first summit conference of the non-aligned states in Belgrade in February 1961 had 25 participants, whereas the seventh conference held in New Delhi (March 1983) was attended by representatives of 97 independent states (50 from Africa, 27 from Asia, 16 from Latin America, 3 from Europe and 1 from Oceania) and by the leaders of two national liberation organisations, the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and the South-West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO).

The growing prestige of the policy and movement of non-alignment is explained by the fact that from the outset it was anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist and worked towards peaceful coexistence and international security.

"The quintessence of the policy of non-alignment," the Political Declaration adopted by the Delhi conference stressed, "has always consisted of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, *apartheid,* racism, including Zionism, and against all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony as well as against great-power and bloc policies. . . ."[1]

Apart from preserving peace, the non-aligned countries, the Political Declaration of the Delhi conference recorded, "have also striven for . . . the es-

---

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries.* Final Documents, New Delhi, March 1983, p. 4 (NAC/Conf. 7/Doc. 1/Rev. 2, March 10, 1983, p. 4).

tablishment of a new world order based on respect for independence, equality and cooperation", which envisions a radical restructuring of both economic and political international relations.

Concern for the destinies of peace and security shown at present by nations of all continents drives them to rely on the unification of all peace-loving forces. Under the circumstances of the growing threat of a nuclear catastrophe, the non-aligned movement is therefore especially gaining in importance as a major anti-war and anti-militarist force.

The imperialist powers, first and foremost the US, oppose the non-aligned movement on all the key issues of world politics. The desire to undermine the movement from within is inherent in the general strategy of imperialism. The movement constantly experiences pressure not only from imperialist forces but also from some of its own members influenced by these forces. The heterogeneous composition of the movement accounts for the different approaches employed by its members in tackling various international problems. This breeds contradictions often resulting in strife within the movement itself on certain specific political and economic problems and at times even on the very content of the policy of non-alignment. Growing pressure exercised by imperialism invigorates elements that seek to revise the movement's primordial fundamental principles, to undermine the unity of the non-aligned nations and to thwart their closer cooperation with the socialist world and other progressive forces. Some members of the movement go as far as to deny

the need for adhering to its anti-imperialist and anti-colonial objectives.

So what are the prospects for the non-aligned movement? Some believe that an alliance of states so heterogeneous in composition can hardly remain united for long and that contradictions and differences between them will inevitably bring about its disintegration. This point of view to a certain extent affects the position of some of the movement's members. Understandably enough, the imperialist forces extensively exploit this in their bid to disunite and undermine the movement and eventually split it.

Nevertheless, the majority of the non-aligned nations do not subscribe to these views and policy and advocate instead a policy of strengthening the movement in every way and consolidating its ranks on the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and peaceful platform complemented in the past few years by the programme of restructuring international economic relations on an equal and democratic basis.

The Soviet Union regards the non-aligned movement as a key factor of present-day international relations and welcomes the growing role and activity of the non-aligned nations in world politics. It stated repeatedly that it is impossible to lessen tensions in all regions of the globe and to settle international problems peacefully without the participation of all states, including non-aligned nations, on an equal basis.

The positions of the non-aligned nations on major international problems, as recorded in documents adopted by their conferences and meetings, in

the main coincide or are close to the positions held by the USSR and other socialist states. The message sent by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers to the participants in the seventh non-aligned conference stressed that "the efforts of the non-aligned movement in the struggle for peace and the security of nations, for ending the arms race, for disarmament, for the restructuring of international economic relations on just and democratic principles and for complete and comprehensive decolonisation always met with warm support in the Soviet Union".[1]

The present publication focusses on the above problems and offers the author's appraisal of the movement's principles and the main resolutions of its conferences as well as an analysis of the attitudes adopted by the US and the socialist community towards this movement.

It is not the aim of the author to cover all or at least the majority of problems facing the non-aligned movement nor to summarise all or at least the majority of studies on the problems of non-alignment undertaken by Soviet researchers. He confines himself to expressing his own opinion of the major problems of and prospects for the non-aligned movement on the basis of an analysis of its documents, pronouncements made by the movement members, and practical results of fulfilling their voluntary commitments.

---

[1] *Pravda,* March 7, 1983.

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

§ 1. The Evolution of Goals and Principles

Following the Second World War the correlation of world forces changed radically in favour of those of socialism and progress. A tangible blow was dealt at the positions of imperialism as a result of the defeat of fascism, in which the Soviet Union had a decisive role to play, the emergence of new, socialist states in Eastern Europe, the formation of the socialist community, the disintegration of the colonial system and the appearance of several dozens of young independent states.

Under the circumstances the imperialists, above all the US, opted for overt enmity and war preparations against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, unleashed the cold war and began knocking together aggressive military blocs. In September 1947, the US imposed upon the Latin American countries a Joint Security Pact for the Defence of the Western Hemisphere. In April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed, formalising the foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO); in September 1951, the US, Australia and New Zealand signed the ANZUS Pact; September

1954 saw the formation of the military-political alliance between the US, Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines (SEATO); and in February 1955, Iraq and Turkey signed the Baghdad Pact, joined later on by Great Britain, Pakistan and Iran (after Iraq withdrew from the Pact in 1959 it was renamed into CENTO).

Imperialism used these military-political alliances and the military bases built around the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to combat the national liberation movements.

Confronted with the growing threat of a military attack, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe concluded in May 1955 the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, which got the name of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

Young states, former colonial and semi-colonial countries found themselves in a complicated international situation, with the world divided into two opposite social systems and with the appearance of two opposite military alliances—the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. Imperialism made use of the existing links between metropolitan countries and their former colonies and dependent countries and the sway wielded by the former on the latter as well as the economic dependence of the young states and repeatedly attempted to draw them into its confrontation with the socialist countries and other states which had chosen the road of progressive social transformations towards genuine independence.

Under the circumstances the developing countries had to look for ways of evolving foreign policy concepts that would, on the one hand, ensure their non-affiliation with the military-political alliances and, on the other, help create the conditions most favourable for the defence of sovereignty gained, for raising the living standards and promoting general socio-economic progress. The policy of non-alignment or, as it was called at the time, the policy of positive neutrality, emerged as such a political concept. It was a far cry from amorphous pacifism or mere abstaining from military political alliances. Instead of isolationism, non-alignment envisioned the establishment and development of equal relations with all countries, cooperation among the developing countries proper and struggle for their economic independence. Non-alignment came into being as a result of the young independent countries' determination to defend their national independence and the legitimate rights of peoples.

The principles and purposes of the UN Charter and the resolutions of the UN General Assembly and the Security Council served as an international legal foundation of the non-aligned movement, with the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems lying at the heart of it. The resolutions of the conferences and meetings of the movement members accord with the UN Charter principles. From the political point of view, the non-aligned movement appears to have two key characteristics. First, it largely helps guarantee the national independence of states, as the non-aligned countries refuse to take part in *any* military al-

liance of relevance to the contention between the two military-political groupings, the aggressive NATO and the defensive Warsaw Treaty. Second, the policy of non-alignment presupposes active participation of states in the drive to implement the UN Charter principles, primarily, the principles of peaceful coexistence, which create favourable conditions for the development of the young states and for strengthening their national independence.

The majority of Asian and African countries espoused the non-alignment principles when the colonial system collapsed and they gained political independence, whereas in Latin America transition to non-alignment had its own peculiarities.

By the end of the Second World War South America had 24 states and 20 relatively small colonial territories located for the most part on islands in the Caribbean. The majority of Latin American countries attained political independence as early as in the beginning of the past century and had covered a considerable road of capitalist development. Their progress was largely checked by their financial and economic dependence on US monopolies and consequently their political dependence on the US.

After the Second World War, Latin American nations waged, along with the struggle against large landowners (two-thirds of the region's population were still engaged in farming) to abolish latifundia and to give democrtic rights to the working people, the struggle to free them from the yoke of monopolies. Some sections of the national bourgeoisie were also interested in certain socio-economic trans-

formations and the curtailment of American influence.

In 1945, the US forced upon the Latin American countries the Act of Chapultepec on establishing a system of Continental Security for the American States and an Economic Charter designed to ensure the inviolability of the positions of foreign capital. It has already been mentioned earlier that in 1947 the US drew Latin American countries into the Joint Security Pact for the Defence of the Western Hemisphere with the aim of subordinating these countries to the Pentagon's military plans and turning them into the strategic hinterland of American imperialism[1].

Despite the measures taken by the US, the struggle against imperialist domination and local reaction, especially military dictatorships, continued gathering momentum. The mounting democratic, anti-imperialist movement in Latin American countries, the victory of the people's revolution in Cuba (1959) and positive changes in some other countries, including Colombia, Venezuela and Peru, demonstrated anew that the US faced growing opposition from the mass of the people and experienced difficulties even in countries dependent on American monopolies. The policy of non-alignment spelt for many countries in the region the protection of their national sovereignty and the weakening of American domination. As is seen, Latin American countries opted for the policy of non-alignment after a long

---

[1] *The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow 1969*, Prague, 1969, p. 29.

"experience" of being parties to "pacts" and "charters" imposed by the US with neo-colonialist purposes.

The idea of non-alignment was first formulated by Jawaharlal Nehru. As Vice-Premier of India's Interim Government, he outlined the basic principles of the country's foreign policy in his speech over the Indian radio on September 7, 1946, and said that India would remain outside groupings and military-political blocs of states, trying at the same time to maintain friendly relations with all the countries. In December 1947, Nehru, who was at that time the Prime Minister of independent India, reiterated and expounded that foreign policy principle in his address to the Indian Constituent Assembly. According to Indian scholars, he devised the doctrine of non-alignment primarily to preserve and promote India's national interests and only later commended it to other Afro-Asian nations as a sound guideline for international behaviour.[1]

Of great importance for the further evolution of the non-alignment principles were the Indian-Chinese talks in April 1954, when the signing of an agreement on the status of Tibet was accompanied, on the suggestion of the Indian delegation, by the adoption of five principles, which went down into history as Pancha shila and which consisted of (1) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, (2) mutual non-aggression, (3) non-interference in each other's internal affairs,

[1] See, for example, I. Malhotra, "Beyond the Delhi Summit", *The Times of India,* March 17, 1983, p. 8.

(4) equality and mutual benefit, and (5) peaceful coexistence. The Pancha shila principles came to be recognised and approved by many young states as the political and legal foundations of the non-aligned movement. The ideas of Afro-Asian unity and joint actions against imperialism and neocolonialism began to be ever more actively advocated even in those developing countries that were members of aggressive military-political blocs.

A landmark event in the developing countries' drawing closer together on the principles of peaceful coexistence was the Bandung Conference (Indonesia, April 18-24, 1955), whose participants[1] considered problems of common interest and concern to countries of Asia and Africa and "discussed ways and means by which their peoples could achieve fuller economic, cultural and political cooperation".

The conference denounced racism and called for the elimination of all vestiges of racism in Asian and African countries. The conferees spoke about the need to eliminate completely colonialism and urged the implementation of the UN resolution on the problem of Palestine. They also advocated disarmament and a ban on the development, testing and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

The key document of the Bandung Conference was the Declaration on the Promotion of World

[1] Out of the 29 participants in the conference only 8 adhered to the principle of non-alignment with blocs (India, Burma, Indonesia, Laos, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nepal, and Egypt); 6 states had military commitments to the US (South Vietnam, Iran, Thailand, Turkey, the Philippines and Japan).

Peace and Cooperation. In it the conferees unanimously reiterated the inalienable right of all nations to self-determination and freedom to choose a political and economic system and a way of life in keeping with the UN Charter principles. They worked out the principles[1] of interstate relations, which constituted a further extension of the Pancha shila principles.

The concept of non-alignment was further devel-

---

[1] 1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.

3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small.

4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country.

5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

6. a) Abstention from the use of collective defence arrangements to serve the particular interests of any of the Great Powers.

b) Abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries.

7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.

8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, such as negotiations, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of the parties' own choice, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.

9. Promotion of mutual interests and cooperation.

10. Respect for justice and international obligations. See *The Non-Aligned Countries,* London, 1982, p. 12.

oped during the meeting Josip Broz Tito and Gamal Abdel Nasser had on the island of Brioni (Yugoslavia) in July 1956. The two sides made a joint statement, reiterating their support for the ideas of the Bandung Conference and spoke out in favour of detente and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war. Later on Tito recalled: "To be able to uphold successfully the basic legitimate rights and to influence international processes, it was necessary to work towards the pooling of those efforts of ours. Despite all the differences, Nehru, Nasser and I, subsequently joined by Sukarno, Nkrumah and others, had similar ideas and strove after one and the same thing, and we made immediate steps to form the non-aligned movement."[1]

§ 2. The Founders of the Non-Aligned Movement

Nehru, Tito, Nasser, Sukarno and Nkrumah are justly referred to as the founders of the non-aligned movement. Their outstanding role was, for instance, cited by Sékou Touré, President of the Republic of Guinea, when he spoke on behalf of some Asian and African countries at the sixth conference of non-aligned countries in Havana. Dr. Ranko Petković, a Yugoslav scholar, believes that "in the movement of non-alignment there have always been statesmen remarkable for their work, consistency, contribution and reputation".[2]

[1] Review *of International Affairs,* Belgrade, No. 704-705, August 20, 1979, p. 15.

[2] *Review of International Affairs,* No. 714, 1980, p. 16.

It has already been mentioned that Nehru is credited with the development of the initial principles of non-alignment. After India had won independence, active support for the national liberation movements and the struggle against colonialism, neocolonialism and racism became key components of its foreign policy. In Nehru's day India contributed to a certain extent to ending the Korean War and consistently spoke out at international forums in favour of putting an end to different local conflicts and withdrawing foreign troops from oher peoples' territories, and against the formation of military blocs and the creation of bases.

Nehru was the first to propose the Pancha shila principles as a political and legal foundation for the concept of non-alignment. He also had an important role to play in the evolution of the non-alignment policy as the newly free countries' active peace-loving course on the world scene, which presupposed their most active influence on the solution of global problems. He was among the main organisers of the Bandung Conference. It was under the influence of the Indian delegation that the conferees attached priority importance in their resolutions to the urgent problems of ensuring peace, disarmament and preventing war.

Nehru invariably strove after an alliance and unity of all the world's progressive forces. For instance, he wrote: "It was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism, and joint deliberation, and, where possible, joint action were desirable."[1]

[1] J. Nehru, *An Autobiography,* New Delhi, 1982, p. 161.

Elaborating on the essence of the policy of non-alignment, Nehru wrote: "We will not attach ourselves to any particular group of states." He added that this policy "has nothing to do with neurality, passiveness or anything else." When freedom and justice are jeopardised or an act of aggression is commited, India can not nor will be neutral.[1]

The foreign policy pursued by the Nehru government caused displeasure among Western powers, and imperialist pressure upon that country heightened. Nehru should be credited with the fact that in those hard conditions he consistently and successfully upheld India's foreign policy on the basis of the non-alignment principle.

The organisation of the first conference of non-aligned countries in Belgrade, its historic decisions and success are largely the result of India's vigorous activities and above all Jawaharlal Nehru's creative and organising effort. After his death in 1964 his successors—Lal Bahadur Shastri and especially Indira Gandhi[2]—fully adhered to his foreign policy and continued taking an active part in the conferences and meetings of the non-aligned countries. Indira Gandhi has done a lot to uphold the basic principles of the movement, its anti-imperialist, anti-militarist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist thrust and the unity of its ranks. She also made a great contribution to the preparation and successful holding of

---

[1] *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, September 1946-May 1949,* Vol. One, Delhi, 1958, pp. 202-203.

[2] On October 31, 1984, she was killed by conspirators. This foul murder shook the whole world.—*Ed.*

the seventh summit conference of non-aligned countries.

Yugoslavia's policy of non-alignment began taking shape in the 1950s when the country, faced with direct imperialist pressure, felt the need for such a foreign policy that would guarantee the diversification and extension of its political, trade and economic contacts and also the political support of Asian, African and Latin American countries. Its espousal of the non-alignment principles found expression in particular, in the final communique issued after Tito's visit to India (December 22, 1954), which said, among other things: "The President of the Republic of Yugoslavia and the Prime Minister of India state that the policy of non-alignment with blocs, adopted and pursued by their governments, is neither 'neutrality' nor 'neutralism' and therefore does not spell passiveness, as is sometimes claimed, but constitutes an active positive and constructive policy aiming at collective peace which is the only possible foundation for collective security."[1]

Tito suggested that the geographical boundaries of the non-aligned movement should be extended. In late 1959, he visited Indonesia, Burma, India, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt and Syria, holding talks and discussing the problem of convening a conference of heads of state and government of all non-aligned countries.

Speaking about Egypt, it is worth mentioning that its road towards the non-aligned movement

[1] *Borba,* December 25, 1954.

was an arduous one. After the Second World War that formally independent state was in fact subordinate to Great Britain, its former metropolitan country. It was not until July 1952 that the patriotically-minded officers of the Egyptian army led by Gamal Abdel Nasser came to power, overthrowing King Farouk's regime and initiating in this way the Egyptian (July) Revolution. Egypt undertook an agrarian reform and in October 1954 Great Britain had to sign an agreement on withdrawing its troops from the Suez Canal zone. June 1956 saw the adoption of a new Constitution, which proclaimed the building of a "socialist and cooperative" society. Despite this Britain maintained fairly stable positions in the country. When the Nasser government set out to eradicate the onerous consequences of the long domination by the British colonialists, to develop the national economy and to raise the people's living standards, international imperialism took some measures to perpetuate Egypt's dependence on the West.

The Nasser government refuted Western bids and undertook a major foreign-policy act by deciding to nationalize the Suez Canal, among whose shareholders were Britain and France. These two imperialist powers, supported by the US, responded to the just actions by the Nasser government by trying to bring pressure to bear on Egypt. Having failed, Britain and France made a deal with Israel and attempted an invasion of Egypt in late October-early November 1956.

The Soviet Union and all the peace-loving forces denounced the aggressors and supported Egypt.

The struggle mounted by the Egyptian people and the resolute political support given by the Soviet Union forced the aggressors to back down for the time being, though the enemy did not relinquish the attempts to thwart the democratic aspirations of the Nasser government.

Egypt's efforts to establish and develop relations with all countries not party to aggressive military blocs became inherent in the Egyptian government's foreign policy devised to rebuff imperialist machinations and to strengthen the country's political and economic independence. In the late 1950s-the early 1960s, Egypt was an essential centre of the national liberation movement in Northern Africa and the Arab region as a whole. Its policy at the time was clearly characterised by anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism and the desire to pursue an independent course in alliance with the progressive and peace-loving forces of all country. Nasser is justly considered one of the founders of the non-aligned movement and its leading advocate in theory and practice.

Indonesia also had a notable role to play at the early stage of the evolution of the non-aligned movement. In President Sukarno's time the country emerged on the international political scene, proclaiming anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, and hosted the Bandung Conference. President Sukarno actively participated in the preparations for and the holding of the first conference of heads of state or government in Belgrade. However, already at that time, considerable differences became manifest in the positions of Indonesia and India. During the

1962 Sino-Indian conflict Indonesia adopted a neutral stand. President Sukarno did not support the initiative made by Tito and Nasser to hold the second conference of the non-aligned countries and insisted on holding another conference of the Bandung type, that is, with the participants restricted only to the Afro-Asian region and in disregard of the non-alignment principles.

Last but not least, special mention should be made of the role played by the Republic of Ghana (the former Gold Coast) which was one of the first African countries to free itself from foreign (British) colonial domination. After its independence was proclaimed in 1957 and the republic formed in 1960, Ghana's first President Kwame Nkrumah and the Convention People's Party (CPP) led by him pursued the policy of doing away with the consequences of colonialism and strengthening and modernising the country's economy. The adopted plans envisaged expansion of the public economic sector and, as far as foreign policy was concerned, Kwame Nkrumah voiced the need to develop diverse relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Ghana actively participated in the preparations for and the holding of the first summit conference in Belgrade, where Nkrumah adopted a clear-cut anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist stand.

The progressive policy pursued by the young republic, which was setting an example of courage and staunchness in working towards independence to other colonial and semi-colonial African countries, riled the imperialist powers and domestic reaction. In February 1966, right-wing army officers support-

ed by senior police officers carried out a counter-revolutionary coup in the country, repealed its Constitution and dissolved its parliament. In 1967, a group of progressive officers made an abortive attempt to overthrow the reactionary regime in Ghana, which saw another coup d'etat led by Ignatius Acheampong in 1972. His government was not, however, to exist for long—he resigned in 1978 and the next year a group of young officers effected another coup d'etat. In these complicated vicissitudes of coups and re-orientation in foreign and home policy, Ghana has ceased to play the role it used to enjoy in the non-aligned movement in Nkrumah's day.

Practical preparations for the first summit conference seem to have started in September 1960, during the 15th UN General Assembly Session. It was at that time that Nehru, Nasser, Tito, Sukarno and Nkrumah held a meeting, during which they agreed to convene a conference of all countries advocating the non-alignment policy. To work out the agenda and the criteria for the issue of invitations to the proposed conference, a preparatory meeting was held in Cairo on June 5-12, 1961, attended by representatives of 21 Asian, African, European and Latin American states. Following the debates, the participants in the meeting said that the forthcoming conference could indeed promote stronger international peace, the development of international cooperation and the fulfilment of the aspirations of millions of people towards independence and a better life. When discussing the problem of the criteria for the issue of invitations to the proposed conference,

the participants in the meeting came to the conclusion that those criteria should reflect the fundamental principles of the non-alignment policy:

"1. The country should have adopted an independent policy based on the coexistence of States with different political and social systems and non-alignment or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy.

"2. The country concerned should be consistently supporting the movements for National Independence.

"3. The country should not be a member of a multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.

"4. If a country has a bilateral military agreement with a Great Power, or is a member of a regional defence pact, the agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.

"5. If it has conceded military bases to a Foreign Power, the concession should not have been made in the context of Great Power conflicts."[1]

As a matter of fact, the invitation criteria remained unchanged after the seventh summit conference in New Delhi.

§ 3. The First Summit Conference

The first conference of heads of state or government of the non-aligned countries officially opened

[1] Quoted from *The Third World Without Superpowers. The Collected Documents of the Non-Aligned Countries,* Vol. I, New York, 1978, p. 38.

in Belgrade on September 1, 1961, attended by 25 members and three observers (Bolivia, Brazil and Ecuador). Its participants included Nehru, Tito, Nasser, Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Sukarno, Nkrumah, U Nu, Dorticos, Makarios and Keita.

On opening the conference, Tito said that it was a forum during which representatives of the non-aligned countries could "with utmost frankness and in full express their points of view of how to form relations between nations and states and how to find ways to solve moot problems by peaceful means, strengthening peace throughout the world and constructive cooperation between nations".[1]

In the course of the plenary meetings the conferees exchanged opinion on many outstanding problems of strengthening international peace and security, eliminating colonialism, neocolonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid, effecting disarmament and banning nuclear tests, and attaining economic development "to contribute more effectively to world peace and security and peaceful cooperation among peoples".[2] The conference adopted important documents—the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and the Statement on the Danger of War and Appeal for Peace. The Declaration stated that: "... a lasting peace can be achieved only if ... colonialism,

---

[1] *Socialist Thought and Practice,* Belgrade, 1979, No. 9, p. 9.

[2] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents of the Gatherings of the Non-Aligned Countries, 1961-1982,* Delhi, 1983, p. 5.

imperialism and neocolonialism in all their manifestations are radically eliminated. . . . "[1]

The conference took place in a complex international situation at the heat of the cold war, and the attention of its participants was riveted to the problem of preserving peace and averting the danger of a new world war. It was pointed out that war among nations was not only something anachronistic but also a crime against humanity. The heads of state and government resolutely rejected the view that war was inevitable and affirmed their faith that the "international community is able to organise its life without resorting to means which actually belong to a past epoch in human history" but relying instead on the principles of peaceful coexistence, which "are the only alternative to the 'cold war' and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe".[2]

Apart from the struggle to preserve peace and to eliminate the danger of war, the conferees recorded the following tasks for further action:

—struggle against colonialism, neocolonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid; support for the national liberation movements;

—support for the struggle to eliminate foreign military bases on other peoples' territories;

—active support for the idea of universal and complete disarmament under strict international control; banning nuclear weapon tests;

---

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 5.
[2] Ibid., pp. 5, 6.

—struggle to do away with economic inequality and to establish just relations in trade with the developing countries;

—organisation of effective economic and trade co-operation between the developing countries.

The Statement on the Danger of War and Appeal for Peace pointed to the already existing tension fraught with the possibility of a world war, which would inevitably lead to devastation on a scale hitherto unknown. The conferees sent a message to the heads of government of the USSR and the USA and called on them to resume negotiations for a peaceful settlement of any outstanding differences between them.[1]

The Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries contained resolutions on some specific international issues that were the order of the day. These included the expression of solidarity with the struggle waged by the Algerian people for their freedom, self-determination and independence; the demand for the re-establishment of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine; the denunciation of the repressive activities by the Portuguese colonialists in Angola; the demand for the withdrawal of French troops from Tunisia; denunciation of imperialist policy in the Middle East and the policy of apartheid in South Africa; support for Cuban demands that the American base in Guantanamo should be dismantled. The conference welcomed the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

[1] Ibid., p. 9.

adopted by the 15th UN General Assembly Session on Soviet initiative.

As far as concrete decisions were concerned, the economic section of the Declaration consisted of mostly declarative calls to establish justice in trade, to eliminate inequality in economic relations, to use the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of the young states' development, and so on.

The first conference of heads of state or government of non-aligned countries was of historic importance, being indeed the first conference representing countries of four continents (rather than a regional conference of the Bandung type, which was attended by representatives of Asian and African countries alone) and only those, whose policy accorded with the criteria formulated at the preparatory meeting in Cairo. It established the criteria for membership in the non-aligned movement and gave the guidelines for the activity of the non-aligned states. It was also the first conference to have set an example of states voluntarily pooling their efforts to struggle for peace and against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

The non-aligned countries refused to turn their movement into a bloc of states. The Declaration said that "the non-aligned countries represented at this Conference do not wish to form a new bloc and cannot be a bloc. They sincerely desire to cooperate with any Government, which seeks to contribute to the strengthening of confidence and peace in the world."[1] Addressing the Belgrade conference, Nehru

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 6.

said: Non-alignment "means nations which object to this lining-up for war purposes, military blocs, military alliances and the like . . . We want to throw our weight, such as it is, in favour of peace."[1]

The appeals of the Belgrade conference to work towards peace and disarmament, to struggle against neocolonialism and to respect the independence and sovereignty of states and their right to a free choice of the road of economic, social and cultural development gradually found growing support among the countries that had freed themselves from colonial dependence and foreign domination.

---

[1] H. D. Malaviya, *Non-Alignment Onward March,* Delhi, 1981, p. 5.

CHAPTER II

MAJOR LANDMARKS

§ 1. The Second to Sixth Summit Conferences

The period following the Belgrade conference was characterised by paramount positive changes in the world, which tangibly affected the further development of the non-aligned movement. The early 1960s saw the collapse of colonial empires—from 1961 to 1964 30 more independent states came into being mostly in Africa and the ranks of the movement members noticeably grew, joined by several Latin American countries, in particular those of the Caribbean.

The expanded membership of the non-aligned movement strengthened the movement's positions in the anti-imperialist struggle and raised the role and authority of the young states at major international forums.

For instance, by the time the sixth conference met in Havana (1979) the non-aligned movement incorporated states with the overall population exceeding 1,698 million, with 418.295 million in African, 1,189.391 million in Asian countries, 67.516 million in Latin American countries, and 22.918 million in European countries. In 20 years the num-

ber of members quadrupled—from 25 to 101. The seventh conference of heads of state and government of non-aligned countries was attended by the representatives of nearly all the African countries, 27 Asian countries and a quarter of American countries.

Before briefly outlining the results of the second to sixth conferences, we should like to point out that in analysing the final documents, attention was primarily focussed on the content of resolutions on the struggle for peace, restructuring international economic relations and combatting the vestiges of colonialism and racism. Some resolutions were reiterated at successive forums because they remained unimplemented from one conference to another.

The *second conference* held in Cairo on October 5-10, 1964, reiterated adherence to the principles and goals of the movement as formulated in the Declaration of the first conference, and adopted the Programme for Peace and International Cooperation.

Elaborating on the Declaration of the Belgrade Conference and citing UN resolutions, delegates declared that the only possible way to strengthen peace was the peaceful coexistence of states with different social and political systems on the basis of the following fundamental principles:

1. The right to complete independence, which is an inalienable right, must be recognised immediately and unconditionally; it is incumbent upon all States to respect this right and facilitate its exercise.

2. The right to self-determination, which is an inalienable right, must be recognised as pertaining

Number of Countries and National Liberation Movements Represented at Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries[1]

Conferences	Participants		Observers		Guests	
Status of the presentation	countries	national liberation movements	countries	national liberation movements	countries	national liberation movements
First conference, Belgrade, Sept. 1-6, 1961	25	—	3	—	—	—
Second conference, Cairo, Oct. 5-10, 1964	46[2]	—	10	—	—	—
Third conference, Lusaka, Sept. 8-10, 1970	54	—	9	—	—	8
Fourth conference, Algiers, Sept. 5-9, 1973	75	—	8	12	3	—
Fifth conference, Colombo, Aug. 16-19, 1976	84[3]	1	8	8	7	—
Sixth conference, Havana, Sept. 3-9, 1979	89[3]	3	12	5	8	1
Seventh conference, New Delhi, March 7-11, 1983	97[4]	2	10	1	10	—

Notes: 1. The Table contains data recorded in the final documents of the conferences. The number of guests and observers does not include representatives of the UN, regional and other organisations.
2. The representative of the Angolan revolutionary government in exile is not included.
3. Without Belize, which was granted a special status.
4. Not attended by representatives of the People's Republic of Kampuchea and St. Lucia.

to all peoples, accordingly, all nations and peoples have the right to determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

3. Peaceful coexistence between States with differing social and political systems is both possible and necessary; it favours the creation of good-neighbourly relations between States with the view to the establishment of lasting peace and general well-being, free from domination and exploitation.

4. The sovereign equality of States must be recognised and respected. It includes the right of all peoples to the free exploitation of their natural resources.

5. States must abstain from all use or threat of force directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States; a situation brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognised, and in particular the established frontiers of States shall be inviolable. Accordingly, every State must abstain from interfering in the affairs of other States, whether openly, or insidiously, or by means of subversion and the various forms of political, economic and military pressure. Frontier disputes must be settled by peaceful means.

6. All States must respect the fundamental rights and freedoms of the human person and the equality of all nations and races.

7. All international conflicts must be settled by peaceful means, in a spirit of mutual understanding and on the basis of equality and sovereignty, in such a manner that justice and legitimate rights are not impaired; all States must apply themselves to pro-

moting and strengthening measures designed to diminish international tension and achieve general and complete disarmament.

8. All States must cooperate with a view to accelerating economic development in the world, and particularly in the developing countries. This cooperation, which must be aimed at narrowing the gap, at present widening, between the levels of living in the developing and developed countries respectively, is essential to the maintenance of a lasting peace.

9. States must meet their international obligations in good faith in conformity with the principles and purposes of the United Nations.[1]

We have made a point of quoting this section of the Declaration because these principles proved pivotal to the entire forthcoming activity of the non-aligned states.

The anti-imperialist thrust of the movement became especially pronounced at the Cairo conference, and the number of concrete peace proposals grew to include the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, the attainment of general and complete disarmament, non-proliferation and the banning of nuclear weapons tests with the subsequent elimination of all their types, and the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes alone.

Compared with the first conference, the non-aligned countries outlined in greater detail their attitude to the problems of eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and liberating the peoples from foreign domination. The conferees came to the conclusion

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 21.

that "colonised people may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations".[1] They also said that the participating countries recognised the national movements of the peoples as being authentic representatives of the colonial peoples. In other words, the non-aligned countries formalised the right of the national liberation movements to armed struggle and, after recognising these movements as the sole representatives of their peoples, gave them an opportunity to take part in the non-aligned movement.

The Cairo conference was the first forum to propose that peace zones free from nuclear weapons, including World Ocean zones, in particular the Indian Ocean, should be set up. The point is that already in the late 1940s American military presence noticeably grew in the Indian Ocean, while the early 1960s saw ever more frequent calls to the Indian Ocean by large US naval units—in 1962, ships of the US Seventh Fleet were stationed in the Bay of Bengal, and in 1963 the CENTO armed forces held military manoeuvres in the Arabian Sea with the participation of an American aircraft-carrier, submarines and ships. In late 1963, a special American armed forces command was formed for the Indian Ocean region. In 1964, an American squadron was already in the Indian Ocean. The latter was turning into a zone, in which American troops could be deployed quickly to respond to crisis situations be-

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

low the level of a general nuclear war and also to enable direct military interference in the affairs of the countries in the region, especially those which had opted for independent development and non-participation in military blocs. In connection with plans for the final replacement of the British armed forces in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf the US raised the question of "filling the vacuum" with the participation of the Gulf states. The latter rejected those plans but the US continued building up its armed presence in the Indian Ocean and set up in 1983 a special command—CENTCOM, to be described a little later.

Problems pertaining to the struggle waged by the national liberation movements featured prominently in the resolutions of the conference. For instance, in the first section of the Programme for Peace and International Cooperation the conferees sharply censured all types of colonial, neocolonialist and imperialist policy, supported the efforts of the Organisation of African Unity to establish peace in Congo, denounced Portugal's colonialist policy and called for the rupture of diplomatic relations with that country and for its trade and economic boycott in order to make it fulfil the resolutions of the UN General Assembly on decolonisation. Censure was passed on the policy pursued by the racist minority in Rhodesia, while the right of the people of South-West Africa to self-determination and independence was reiterated. The conference confirmed the right of the Palestinian people to their homeland and declared its utmost support for their liberation struggle.

The conferees expressed their support for the UN resolutions on sanctions against South Africa and for the first time called on all the countries to break diplomatic, consular and other relations with the South African racists.

The economic section of the final documents stated that all countries were obliged to facilitate the speedy development of a new, more just world system of economic relations. The participants in the meeting were gratified to see that the proposals of the Belgrade conference found reflection in the documents of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (June 1964), voiced support for the Joint Declaration of the Group of 77[1] adopted at that conference, and urged all states to implement on an urgent basis the recommendations contained in the Final Act of the UNCTAD and in particular to cooperate in bringing into existence as early as possible the new international institutions proposed therein, so that the problems of trade and economic development may be more effectively and speedily resolved.[2] The final document also contained recommendations to revise the rates of the young states' development, to devise programmes to boost their foreign exchange earnings, to organise economic integration of these countries, to increase the amount

[1] The Group of 77 was formed at the UN Conference on Trade and Development held in Geneva from March 23 to June 16, 1964, with the aim of working out concerted positions of the Asian, African and Latin American developing countries on foreign economic problems. At present the group incorporates more than 120 states.

[2] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 25.

of capital transferred to developing countries and also to improve the terms and conditions governing that transfer without political strings.[1]

The third conference of the non-aligned countries, Lusaka (Zambia), September 8-10, 1970, was held against the backdrop of slightly alleviated international tensions in Europe and the worsening situation in Indochina and in the Arab East.

The Lusaka conference was the first to have as guests representatives of national liberation movements, including the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO), the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the National Movement for the Liberation of the Comoro Islands (MOLINACO), the Front for the Liberation of the Coast of Somalia (FLCS-French Somaliland), and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO). The conference declared its complete support for the struggle of the Indochinese peoples against the US aggression. It was at the Lusaka conference that the non-aligned countries openly denounced for the first time the US, France, West Germany, Italy and Japan for their political, economic and military cooperation with South Africa, which encouraged the racist regime to carry on the policy of apartheid.

The Declaration on Peace, Independence, Development, Cooperation and Democratisation of In-

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment,* p. 25.

ternational Relations paid attention to the alarming scale of other states' interference in the internal affairs of the non-aligned countries, to the persisting and even widening gap in the economic development between the developed and developing countries; reiterated the principles of non-alignment recorded at the first conference, and specified the aims of the movement formulated in the following way:

—the pursuit of world peace and peaceful coexistence by strengthening the role of non-aligned countries within the United Nations so that it will be a more effective obstacle against all forms of aggressive actions and the threat or use of force against the freedom, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country;

—the fight against colonialism and racism;

—the settlement of disputes by peaceful means;

—the ending of the arms race followed by universal disarmament;

—opposition to Great-Power military bases and foreign troops on the soil of other nations in the context of Great-Power conflicts and colonial and racist suppression;

—the universality of and the stating of strengthening of the efficacy of the United Nations;

—the struggle for economic and mutual cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.[1]

The Declaration on Disarmament proclaimed the 1970s as the Disarmament Decade and gave detailed recommendations to reduce nuclear and con-

[1] Ibid., pp. 46-47.

ventional weapons, to take confidence-building measures, to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and to explore and use outer space for peaceful purposes only. The conferees suggested that a World Disarmament Conference should be convened[1].

The Lusaka conference also made a Declaration on Non-Alignment and Economic Progress. The document pointed to the widening gap between the economies of the rich and the poor nations, the decline in the share of developing countries from the mainstream of world economic life, the decline in the share of developing countries in world export trade, and the decline in financial flows from developed to developing countries and the increase in financial flows from developing countries to developed countries by way of payments of debts, dividends, and royalties. Keeping in mind the circumstances unfavourable for the developing countries, the participants in the meeting decided to foster mutual cooperation among developing countries, to contribute to each other's economic and social progress by an effective utilisation of the complementarities between their respective resources and requirements, to intensify and broaden to the maximum extent practicable the movement for cooperation and integration among developing countries at subregional and inter-regional levels, and take into account the necessary measures required to guarantee that the peoples of developing countries concerned receive the benefit of the integration and not the foreign companies operating within the integrated

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 57.

area.[1] To tackle the tasks set, a detailed programme of action was worked out that included problems of planning, trade, cooperation and development, industrial and other production, the development of infrastructure, and the application of scientific and technological accomplishments.

The participating heads of state and government recorded in the Declaration on Non-Alignment and Economic Progress their determination to raise at the next UN Session the question of adopting a Declaration on the International Strategy, which would envisage the aims and tasks of development and also the policy and measures to accomplish them. Among other things, a provision was to be made for maximising the use of raw materials, to promote their processing in areas of production and to provide access to consuming markets in the capitalist countries for processed products by young states. It was also recommended to undertake other measures to secure for developing countries an increasing share of international trade in manufactured and semi-manufactured goods.

The heads of state and government of the non-aligned countries agreed to propose that the forthcoming UN Session adopt, apart from their economic development initiatives, a Declaration on Strengthening International Peace and Security, an Action Programme to implement speedily and completely the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, a Programme for the Disarmament Decade and a Decla-

[1] Ibid., p. 48.

ration on Principles of the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed. With the adoption of the Declaration on Non-Alignment and Economic Progress it has become a tradition with the subsequent conferences to adopt two major documents, one focussing on political issues and referred to as a Political Declaration and the other recording resolutions on economic problems and called an Economic Declaration.

Last but not least, the Lusaka conference was the first forum to propose that the UN debate the question of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

It was only natural and logical that the subsequent conferences of non-aligned states should attach growing importance to economic problems because, as their political independence strengthened, the majority of the developing countries faced ever more acute problems of gaining economic independence. Certain measures were taken at the Lusaka conference to form the non-aligned countries' organisation mechanism to ensure constant contacts among them and to implement the conference's decisions. As a result of the debates the chairman of the movement (the President or the Prime Minister of the country which hosted the latest conference) was entrusted "with the function of taking all necessary steps to maintain contacts among member States, ensure continuity, and carry into effect the decisions, resolutions and directives of the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries."[1] The representatives of the non-aligned countries at the UN and

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment,* pp. 57-58.

other international bodies had to coordinate their efforts to ensure the implementation of the resolutions, decisions and directives adopted by their conferences.

The fourth summit conference of the non-aligned countries (Algiers, September 5-9, 1973) gave in its final documents (the Political Declaration, the Economic Declaration, the Action Programme of Economic Cooperation and separate resolutions on specific political and economic problems) the fullest possible outline of the political and economic platforms of the non-alignment policy.

In their Political Declaration the non-aligned countries mentioned certain favourable aspects of the obtaining international situation and the marked strengthening of the forces of peace, independence and progress. At the same time they pointed out that "although substantial progress has been made in the easing of tensions between East and West, the fact that nations are faced with colonialism, domination and occupation, neocolonialism, imperialism and Zionism remains an indisputable reality of our times".[1]

The participants in the Algiers conference reiterated the goals and principles of non-alignment formulated earlier and for the first time wrote in their Political Declaration: "In order to undertake the international obligations in totality and to help solve the problems of our times, which concern the fate of all nations of the world, the non-aligned countries should, together with all progressive forces,

[1] Ibid., p. 93.

work to change international relations on the basis of democracy and equality of all states . . . ."[1] The Political Declaration formalised the new aspects of the non-aligned countries' approach to the problem of detente, namely, the conferees demanded that it spread to all the areas of the world and that wars still going on in Africa, South-East Asia (Kampuchea), and the Middle East (the Israeli aggression) should be stopped. The resolutions of the conference for the first time contained the direct denunciation of Zionism as a form of racism, while the Declaration on the Struggle for National Liberation reads as follows: "Having exhausted all peaceful means, and faced with the tenacity of the colonial powers and the collaboration of their protectors, including members of NATO (the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany), the oppressed nations have no resource other than armed struggle as a way of eliciting respect for their rights to self-determination and independence."[2]

The non-aligned countries pledged to strengthen their military, economic, political and moral support to liberation movements and decided to create a fund of solidarity and aid in order to enlist the support of other states in this matter. In addition to resolutions adopted earlier, the conference endorsed the resolution on measures to isolate colonial, racist and apartheid regimes, including the breaking off, suspension, or freezing of all relations

---

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment,* p. 94.
[2] Ibid., p. 109.

with Portugal, South Africa, Rhodesia, and Israel; the exposure of these regimes at all international forums; the exposure of the support given by some of the Western governments to colonialists and the regimes in South Africa, Rhodesia and Israel.

Among the resolutions passed by the participants in the Algiers forum on economic problems are the Economic Declaration, the Action Programme of Economic Cooperation, and some resolutions specifying the provisions of the Declaration and the Programme. The Declaration on Non-Alignment and Economic Progress made by the third summit conference of the non-aligned countries merely called for joint actions and cooperation and suggested that the problem of altering international economic relations be tackled at the UN. The fourth summit conference went as far as to approve recommendations to the developing countries participating in the non-aligned movement to set up "bodies of solidarity to defend the interests of the primary producer countries, such as the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries and the ICCEC [Intergovernmental Council of Copper Exporting Countries] which are able to undertake a large-scale exploitation of natural resources and to make possible greater exports and real earnings as well as the utilisation of these resources for development purposes and raising the standard of living of their peoples."[1]

The heads of state and government of the non-aligned countries noted in their Economic Declara-

[1] Ibid., p. 102.

tion that "imperialism is still the greatest stumbling block to the emancipation and advancement of developing countries. . . . Imperialism is not only opposed to the economic and social progress of developing countries, but has also adopted an aggressive attitude towards those who stand in the way of its designs and seeks to impose political, social and economic structures which facilitate foreign domination, dependence or neocolonialism."[1]

Sharp criticism was levelled at the activities of transnational corporations in the developing countries. "The Heads of State and Government denounce before the world public the inadmissible practice of multinational companies, which encroach upon the sovereignty of developing countries and violate the principles of non-interference and the right of nations to self-determination."[2]

The Economic Declaration of the fourth summit conference served as the basis for proposals made by the members of the movement in spring 1974 at the Sixth Special Session of the UN General Assembly on problems of raw materials and economic development.

Relying on the resolutions passed by the Algiers conference on economic problems, the non-aligned states began using in practice collective forms of struggle against neocolonialism and for the introduction of new principles of international economic relations. We can cite as an example the first serious blows dealt at what seemed to be the unshak-

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment,* p. 99.
[2] Ibid., p. 102.

able positions of the international oil cartel and some foreign monopolies. The same is also borne out by the joint actions of the Group of 77 at conferences of UN bodies and the UN General Assembly sessions. In December 1974, the regular UN General Assembly session incorporated the Declaration on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order and the Action Programme adopted by the UN General Assembly special session on the initiative of the developing countries in spring 1974 into a new general document—the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which has ever since been a major UN document designed to regulate economic relations among the UN member states.

The Algiers conference paid considerable attention in its resolutions to cooperation between the non-aligned and socialist countries. For instance, the Action Programme of Economic Cooperation said that "the non-aligned countries are determined to encourage the development of scientific and technical cooperation with the socialist countries, primarily by signing inter-governmental conventions, by creating the necessary mixed committees and by strengthening relations among interested organisations and institutions".[1]

The Algiers conference also passed a resolution on establishing the Coordinating Bureau of non-aligned countries because, as their number grew, they increasingly experienced the need for a permanent body.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 107.

The Coordinating Bureau has to carry out the totality of the preparatory work for the next conference, to elaborate problems to be discussed by it, to coordinate the actions and positions of the non-aligned states, particularly at the UN, and to facilitate the implementation of resolutions passed by the preceding conferences.

The fifth conference of the non-aligned countries held from August 16 to 19, 1976, in Colombo (Sri Lanka), the first forum to be convened in Asia, took place against the backdrop of some major triumphs scored by the national liberation movements in Africa and South-East Asia, the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, detente in international relations, the collapse of the fascist regimes in Spain and Greece, the overthrow of the emperial regime in Ethiopia, and the victorious people's democratic revolutions in Vietnam and Laos. Addressing the conference, Tito pointed out that, owing to the efforts of the non-aligned, socialist and other peace-loving forces, as well as other progressive and democratic forces on the globe, major success had been scored in emancipating peoples and persons.

The conference passed some key documents, including the Political Declaration, the Economic Declaration, the Action Programme for Economic Cooperation and several resolutions on specific problems.

A major accomplishment of the Colombo conference was an extensive programme worked out by its participants on security and disarmament problems. The conferees stressed that the expenditure on

armaments that has been increasing at a phenomenal rate and has now reached the staggering figure should be stopped and "a substantial part of the resources freed by measures in the field of disarmament by the main world military powers could be used to promote the economic development of developing countries. Such measures would certainly contribute towards a bridging of the gap between developed and developing countries within the foreseeable future."[1] The 10th Special UN General Assembly Session devoted to disarmament held in May-June 1978 included these demands by the developing countries which were supported by the socialist states into its resolutions.

A tangible contribution to the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism was made by the conference resolutions on South Africa, Namibia, the non-recognition of South African bantustans, on the denunciation of racial discrimination and apartheid on the African continent (especially apartheid in sports), on the Middle East, the question of Palestine, and so on. The fifth conference reiterated the resolution on the Indian Ocean worked out earlier and supplemented it with new provisions, condemning the establishment, maintenance and expansion of foreign military bases, such as Diego Garcia, urging the Great Powers to refrain from all activities that might interfere with the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and called on the US to dismantle existing bases and mil-

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 207.

itary installations and also not to deploy nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in that region. The non-aligned states suggested that all countries in the basin should refuse to grant facilities to warships and military aircraft that could be used to undermine the sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of states of the region in contravention of the UN Charter. Finally, they expressed their resolve to concert their actions towards convening a Conference on the Indian Ocean as soon as possible and "to adopt measures for the implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".[1]

In connection with the Middle East situation, the conference reiterated previous resolutions, condemning the Israeli aggression and also continued American military, economic and political aid to Israel and sharply criticised the countries that supplied Israel with weapons. The conferees said that they would look for measures to bring pressure to bear on Israel within the framework of the UN and its specialized agencies, up to the possible expulsion of Israel from those organisations. They denounced the obstructionist stand adopted by the US at the UN Security Council and welcomed the UN decision to invite the PLO to take part in all of its sessions as the representative of the Palestinian people, and called on those non-aligned countries that still maintained diplomatic and economic relations with Israel to break them.

The stronger anti-imperialist thrust of the non-

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, pp. 201, 202.

aligned movement was also manifest in the resolution on South Africa: the conferees urged all states to give greater aid to the people of South Africa and to refuse to grant facilities to aircraft and ships going to and from that country.

The Economic Declaration pointed to "the glaring inequalities and imbalances in the international economic structure" and the impressive growth of the payments balance deficit of the developing countries. The participants in the conference said that their attempts to reform existing international economic relations were futile. They confirmed the right of the developing countries to full compensation for the colonialist exploitation of their natural and other resources and stressed that "the developing countries should use their sovereignty and their independence at the political level as a lever for the attainment of their sovereignty and independence at the economic level".[1]

The resolutions of the fourth conference served as the foundation for the development of mutual cooperation between the non-aligned and other developing countries and facilitated international talks on establishing a new international economic order and, as a consequence, the adoption by the UN of such key documents as the Declaration and the Action Programme intended to establish the new international economic order, whereas the recommendations of the fifth conference were designed to "evolve suitable mechanisms to fully utilise the complementarities, resources and capabilities within the

[1] Ibid., p. 209.

developing world for mutual benefit and for collective economic advancement."[1]

The Colombo conference also made important resolutions on economic cooperation between the non-aligned and other developing countries, among them the decision to set up new producers' associations of raw materials and to found a special fund for the financing of buffer stocks, to work out a united position at the forthcoming UNCTAD session and the principles of international trade, to ratify the Convention on the Solidarity Fund for Economic and Social Development, and to develop multilateral industrial cooperation.

The Colombo conference also decided to form the Press Agencies Pool of the Non-Aligned Countries and endorsed the constitution of the Press Agencies Pool. The decision was a major step taken by the non-aligned countries in doing away with the Western powers' domination of the mass media inherited from the colonial times. The Pool was to ensure wide and free dissemination of objective information about the developing countries and the non-aligned movement.

The *sixth conference* (Havana, September 3-9, 1979) was held in a complicated political situation. The collusion of the US and Israeli governments and the Sadat regime in Egypt had sharply aggravated the situation in the Middle East. The Chinese leaders of the period were responsible for the exacerbated situation on the Sino-Vietnamese border, and by the time the Havana conference opened there occurred conflicts between non-aligned countries,

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 211.

sometimes, unfortunately, with recourse to arms. Under the circumstances the imperialist forces, primarily the US, stepped up their attempts to discredit and thwart the conference. The United States and its NATO allies resorted to different measures to make the participants in the movement renounce fundamental principles and aims of non-alignment with its pronounced anti-imperialist thrust. American officials got hold of a copy of the draft final document of the forthcoming forum and used diplomatic and other channels to discredit the draft resolution. When the conference started its work, representatives of some Western countries tried to make it discuss matters of secondary importance and "drown" solutions to the burning problems of our day in endless debates.

The Havana conference was a landmark event in the history of the non-aligned movement. Apart from reiterating its basic principles, the conferees further elaborated them, enhancing their anti-imperialist tendencies. Let us give several examples. Thus, the resolutions on peaceful coexistence, detente and disarmament stated that peaceful coexistence continued to be the only alternative to the threat of a military confrontation. The conferees spoke out in favour of strengthening international detente and spreading it to other regions of the world. Of paramount importance was the support shown by the non-aligned countries for detente in Europe and for its continuation, which strengthened the security of all states, especially those not party to military alliances.[1]

[1] Ibid., p. 421.

The final documents adopted by the conference on the Middle East said that the Camp David Agreements "mean total abandonment of the cause of the Arab countries and an act of complicity with the continued occupation of the Arab territories and violate the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine".[1] Proceeding from the belief that any departure from the resolutions adopted earlier by the non-aligned movement on the Middle East interfered with the struggle waged by the Arab peoples and undermined its unity, the participants in the meeting condemned the Camp David Agreements and the Treaty between Egypt and Israel and considered the proposal by some Arab states "that the Government of Egypt be suspended as a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for having violated its principles and resolutions".[2] The conference decided to entrust the Coordinating Bureau, acting as an Ad Hoc Committee, with the examination of the damage caused to the Arab countries by the actions of the Egyptian government, and with the subsequent report on that matter to the ministerial conference.

The conference resolutely condemned the activities of the imperialist powers, especially the US, in expanding their military presence in the Middle East and urged the UN Security Council to adopt sanctions against Israel in keeping with Chapter 7 of the UN Charter and, if vetoed by the US, to convene a special UN General Assembly Session.

---

[1] Two Decades of Non-Alignment, p. 414.
[2] Ibid.

The conference also called for greater support for the Palestinian people and the peoples of other Arab countries fighting for their national rights and interests.[1]

The delegates to the Havana forum unanimously supported all the essential initiatives on decolonisation made by African countries, namely, they voiced their wholehearted support for the struggle of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa and approved the request of the 16th OAU summit conference, held in Monrovia, to the Secretary-General of the OAU and the United Nations Special Committee Against Apartheid to organise an international conference to mobilize world public opinion in support of effective application of economic and other sanctions against South Africa. The conference called on all the states to step up their support for the national liberation movements in the south of Africa and spoke highly of the role played by the non-aligned states, the UN and the OAU, the socialist and Scandinavian countries, and other democratic and progressive forces in backing the national liberation struggle in that region. Em-

---

[1]The Exraordinary 7th Special UN Generai Assembly Session devoted to the Palestinian issue was convened in July 1980 on the initiative of the Arab states. The Assembly reiterated that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East could not be established until Israel withdrew from all the occupied territories and reiterated the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to an independent, sovereign state of their own. The US, Israel, Canada, Australia, Norway, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic voted against the UN General Assembly resolution.

phasis was placed on the need to show greater solidarity and give more aid to the 'frontline states"[1] (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia). The participants in the Havana summit resolutely opposed the backing by the US, Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Belgium, Italy, Canada, Australia and Israel of the racist regimes and called them accomplices in the crimes perpetrated by the latter.

The conferees analysed in greater detail than it was done at the preceding meetings the political situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, mentioning the growing role the countries of the region played in the non-aligned movement (Latin America was represented at the Havana conference by 11 full-fledged members of the movement and representatives of 11 more states attended the conference as observers; Bolivia, Grenada, Nicaragua and Surinam were admitted as the ful-fledged members of the non-aligned movement). The resolutions passed recorded full solidarity with the struggle waged by Latin Americans for their national liberation and specifically expressed solidarity with the peoples of Puerto Rico and Belize. The Final Declaration sharply condemned anew American policy towards Cuba and voiced full solidarity with the demands by Cuba as well as Puerto Rico that the US should dismantle its military bases on the territories of those countries. The conference also supported the just demand by Argentina for the return of the Falklands (Malvinas) to it.

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 412.

The sixth summit conference noted with satisfaction growing solidarity shown by the members of the movement with the struggle of the Chilean people. The conferees welcomed the victory of the people of Nicaragua over the Somoza dictatorship and spoke highly of the efforts made by the governments of many Latin American states, including Cuba, Mexico, Bolivia and Colombia, to ensure a just solution to the Nicaraguan problem. At the same time they denounced the imperialist machinations designed to establish all sorts of links between South Africa and some Latin American states, especially Paraguay and Chile, to protect imperialist interests in the South Atlantic. Censure was also passed on expanded and stronger ties between Israel and some Latin American countries, including Guatemala and El Salvador, which "in practice constitutes support for the Zionist state's expansionist and aggressive policy".[1]

Discussions of the political climate in South-East Asia centred on the representation of Kampuchea at the conference. During the ministerial conference held in Havana before the summit meeting, 20 out of the 32 delegates who spoke on the issue were against letting the representatives of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sari regime, which had been overthrown by the people, take part in the conference but the issue was transferred for consideration by the plenary meeting of the summit conference on the insistence of some delegates, in particular the representatives of the ASEAN countries (Singapore, Malaysia and

[1] Ibid., p. 421.

Indonesia), who were in favour of admitting the Pol Pot representatives to the conference. Plenary meeting debates revealed considerable differences in the approach to the problem.

Some delegations condemned the Pol Pot regime for its monstrous genocide but nevertheless deemed it possible to let its representatives attend the conference. At the same time they refused to recognise as legitimate international support rendered to Kampuchea (in particular, the bringing of a limited contingent of the Vietnamese armed forces to Kampuchea), disregarding the fact that the aid was given only on the request of the legitimate government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea with the aim of speedily eliminating the Pol Pot gangs.

Another group of countries, including Cuba, Angola, Mozambique, Madagascar, Benin, Libya and Syria, resolutely denounced the overthrown Pol Pot-Ieng Sari regime and declared that the government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea could be the only legitimate representative of the Kampuchean people and hence Kampuchea's seat at the summit belonged to the delegation of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Still another fairly numerous group of countries proposed that both representatives either be allowed to take part in the conference or be barred from it. In a bid to bridge the gap between the different points of view, Sri Lanka suggested that the solution of the problem be postponed till the next conference. As a result of protracted deliberations it was decided to leave Kampuchea's seat va-

cant and to entrust a committee set up specially for the purpose to prepare suggestions on the problem.

The conferees voiced anew their determination to work towards turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace by implementing the Declaration adopted by the UN General Assembly session on December 16, 1971.[1]

The conferees called on all states to cooperate in implementing the resolution on making the Mediterranean a zone of peace and also all UN resolutions with the aim of eliminating the causes for tensions existing in the region. The conference welcomed Malta's decision to dismantle foreign military bases on its territory.

The final document of the conference—Interference and Intervention in the Internal Affairs of States—centered on the activities of the imperialist forces and their use of the political, economic and military means and the mass media to undermine and destabilise the situation in the non-aligned countries.

Taking into account the growing number of conflicts between the developing states themselves, the conferees proclaimed adherence to the commitment to settle conflicts by peaceful means only.

[1] The Declaration called on the Great Powers to start immediately consultations with the states in the basin in order to check the escalation of military presence, to dismantle all foreign bases, military installations and means of military communication, to prevent the deployment of nuclear and other mass destruction arms in the Indian Ocean. The resolution was voted by 61 delegations, with no negative vote and 55 abstentions (see UN documents A/Res./2832 (XXVI)).

They pointed to the growing role played by the non-aligned countries at the UN and, giving the UN its due for being an effective instrument of promoting international peace and security, stressed the need for using it to a greater extent in settling disputes among states. They listed the positive results of growing cooperation among the non-aligned countries in the field of information and the mass media in accordance with the resolutions of the previous summit conference and adopted a resolution on the further development of cooperation in exchanging information.

It is only natural that the conference paid considerable attention to economic problems. Though some constructive decisions were made on the problem by the preceding conferences beginning with the Algiers conference in 1973 (let it be recalled that the latter laid emphasis on collective and coordinated forms of combatting neocolonialism), none of them had been put into practice because of the policy pursued by the developed capitalist countries. In this connection the heads of state or government expressed serious concern over the sharpening contradictions in the entire system of international economic relations among the capitalist countries. As a result of the capitalist powers' policy the gap between the developed and developing countries widened and the latter faced even less favourable terms of trade.

The conference resolutions, in particular its Economic Declaration and also the Action Programme of Economic Cooperation and some additional resolutions, specified the programme of struggle for the

establishment of the new international economic order. It included the exercise by the developing countries of full and effective sovereignty and control over their natural and other resources and economic activity, fixing prices on raw material commodities and semi-manufactured goods, and control over foreign capital and the activities of the transnational corporations.[1]

The conference passed resolutions and recommendations on the non-aligned countries' actions to solve problems of raw material commodities, industrialisation, trade, scientific and technological development, farming and food supply, and economic and technical cooperation, outlined the attitude to the transnational corporations and assessed the results of the strategy of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

The heads of state and government reviewed the implementation of the Action Programme of Economic Cooperation and expressed concern over the insufficient progress made in attaining its goal and mapped out some additional measures to promote cooperation.

As far as the results of the sixth summit conference in Havana are concerned, the progressive forces can be credited with succeeding, despite the manoeuvres of the enemies of the movement, in maintaining its anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist tendencies. The conference was on the whole keynoted by the struggle of the developing countries for their economic independence, peace, detente,

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, p. 435.

the ending of the arms race and for disarmament. Analysis of the conference documents gives ground to conclude that they reflected positions similar or very close to those held by the socialist countries on the major problems of our day.

§ 2. The Seventh Summit Conference

So far the Delhi conference was the most representative one in the history of the non-aligned movement. Problems of the struggle for peace, security, putting an end to the arms race and for disarmament were pivotal to its work and, characteristically enough, were viewed in close relationship with all other problems facing the non-aligned countries at the present stage.

The conference reiterated that anti-imperialism was, as before, the main and uniting factor of the non-aligned movement and declared resolute support for the national liberation movement and the complete eradication of colonialism and racism.

It should be pointed out here that the Western press repeatedly posited that, with the ranks of the non-aligned movement growing and given its heterogeneous socio-economic and political composition it would inevitably weaken and become less critical of the imperialist states, while centrifugal tendencies would grow along with the number of conflict situations. The Western press harped on the eve of the Delhi conference that it would primarily focus on the conflict between Iran and Iraq, the situation in Western Sahara and Chad, and also on the Afghan and Kampuchean "problems".

These hopes of the Western reactionaries were not to materialise, however. The conferees voiced their concern over the destinies of peace, which was greatly jeopardized as a result of the policy of the large-scale arms race (above all nuclear), pursued by the imperialist states, first and foremost by the Reagan administraion, and the stepped up military expansion in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania. By claiming vast regions of the world to be zones of their "vital interests", the forces of imperialism are setting up new military bases and making more sophisticated those already in existence on territories of dozens of states, including members of the non-aligned movement (Somalia and Kenya), and building their strongholds.

The evolution of the non-aligned movement, incidentally, just like the rest of the developing world, is characterised by the growing recognition of the fact that imperialism's aggressive foreign policy is directed not only against the socialist countries but also against the developing ones.

The New Delhi Message, the Political and Economic Declarations, and resolutions on specific problems adopted by the conference said that today's tendencies in international relations were extremely dangerous and that there existed the threat of a world nuclear catastrophe.[1] India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, the chairman of the non-aligned movement for the next three years, said in her speech at the summit that "today the alternative

[1] *Review of International Affairs*, No. 792, April I, 1983, p. 20.

to peaceful coexistence is the end of existence".[1] The heads of state and government attached paramount importance to the problem of prohibiting the development, testing and use of nuclear weapons of all types, strategic or tactical, conventional or neutron, and so on. The Political Declaration said: "Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass destruction. The Heads of State or Government therefore find it unacceptable that the security of all States and *the very survival of mankind* [emphasis by the author] should be held hostage to the security interests of a handful of nuclear-weapon States.... They rejected all theories and concepts pertaining to the possession of nuclear weapons and their use under any circumstances.[2] In the name of humanity they demanded an immediate prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon states. They further called for a freeze on the development, production, stock-piling and deployment of nuclear weapons and the speedy finalisation of a comprehensive treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons.

It is worth mentioning that in their plenary meeting speeches some delegates firmly supported the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, for example, the proposals of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states to conclude a treaty on the

[1] *The Times of India,* March 17, 1983.

[2] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries,* Final Documents, New Delhi, March 1983, p. 9.

mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace. Let it be recalled in this connection that in 1982 the Soviet Union voiced at the Second Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament its commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The New Delhi Message admitted the dangerous trends existing in international relations and stated the desire of the participants in the forum to see "an immediate halt to the drift towards nuclear conflict", and called on the nuclear powers to observe the existing agreements and be more active in the arms reduction talks. As for the Soviet Union, it resolutely advocates the ending of the arms race (first and foremost nuclear arms), the lessening and eventual complete elimination of the threat of a nuclear war. The Soviet position on these problems is well known.

The Delhi conference showed that the non-aligned nations were not indifferent to the outstanding and vital problems of our day. The conferees affirmed that they were united in their common striving towards peaceful coexistence and such a restructuring of international economic relations that would guarantee a lasting peace on our planet, security for all the nations and their prosperity. One of the final documents stressed that "...in the present-day world there is no alternative to a policy of peaceful coexistence, detente and cooperation among States, irrespective of their economic and social systems, size and geographical location".[1]

The participants in the Delhi forum came out

[1] Ibid. p. 6.

again in support of the legitimate and inalienable right of the Palestinian people to a national sovereign state of their own and censured Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

The conference favoured the speedy implementation of the UN Security Council resolution on granting independence to Namibia. It is indicative that the conferees forthrightly rejected all attempts to "tie" the declaration of Namibia's independence up with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

Compared with the previous conferences, more attention was devoted to Latin American problems, which is only natural, because the region is witnessing the mounting struggle against foreign, above all, American diktat. The heads of state or government expressed their profound concern over persistent tensions in Central America, the Caribbean and the South Atlantic. In their view, Central America faced a serious political, social and economic crisis aggravated "by the intensification of imperialist interference in the internal affairs of the States of the region".[1] The final documents of the conference contained a unanimous protest against the acts of aggression against the people of Nicaragua, interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador, Surinam and Belize, condemned the economic blockade of Cuba by the US and bitterly criticised the US refusal to abide by its agreement with Panama's government. The US aggression against Grenada that followed in November 1983 showed

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 34.

again that the condemnation of American interference in the affairs of sovereign states was justified and topical. The Falklands (Malvinas) crisis served as an unforgettable lesson for the Latin American peoples, revealing as never before the true face of American imperialism, which neglected its commitments given in the act of continental security and, instead of joining Latin American countries to defend Argentina's sovereign rights over the Malvinas (Falklands), teamed up with the British aggressor.

The participants in the conference passed resolutions in which they expressed their solidarity with all the peoples of Latin America fighting for their independence and called on all states to render support to the peoples still under colonial domination and dependence. It was reiterated that respect for "the right of any State to freely choose its own political, social and economic system"[1] was of paramount importance to the political solution of international problems. As for the Malvinas (Falklands), the conferees called on Argentina and Britain to resume negotiations with the participation of the UN Secretary-General to reach a peaceful and just solution of the problem in keeping with the principles and resolutions of the non-aligned movement and the UN General Assembly resolutions Nos. 1514/XV/, 2065/XX/, 3160/XVIII/, 31/49 and 37/9.

The conference backed all the efforts and initiatives by Latin American countries to declare Central America and the Caribbean a zone of peace.

[1] Ibid., p. 35.

The problem of the Indian Ocean featured prominently in the work of the forum and its final documents. The heads of state and government unanimously supported the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and expressed their full support for Mauritian sovereignty over the Chagos archipelago, including Diego Garcia, which was detached from the territory of Mauritius by Britain in 1965. The conferees thought that the establishment and strengthening of the military base at Diego Garcia "endangered the sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of Mauritius and other States".[1]

Unfortunately, the legitimate demands of the state of Mauritius have not been met so far. What is more, under the Reagan administration the US armed forces considerably increased their presence in the Indian Ocean and the number of their military bases also grew. Diego Garcia is becoming an important base for the Rapid Deployment Force and American strategic nuclear weapons. The problem of dismantling the US military base on Diego Garcia as well as other American bases in South Africa, Jibouti, Kenya and some other countries in the Indian Ocean is essential for the relaxation of international tensions and creating peace zones.

The heads of state and government expressed concern over the growing number of disputes and conflicts between the movement members. These conflicts, which claim the toll of thousands of peo-

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 20.

ple, cause enormous material damage to the economies of these countries and jeopardize peace and progress as well as the unity and solidarity of non-aligned countries.

The conference again stated that all disputes should be solved exclusively by peaceful means, in full accordance with the purposes, principles and provisions of the UN Charter and the principles and objectives of the non-aligned movement.

Though that statement was unanimously approved by all the conferees, this failed to lead to, say, a ceasefire between Iran and Iraq.

Before the Delhi Conference opened the press in many Western countries, as it has been mentioned earlier, extensively speculated on the possible clash of opinions on such issues, as the "problems of Kampuchea and Afghanistan", and the resultant break-down of the conference or at least the weakening of its anti-imperialist thrust. These hopes never came true, much to the disillusionment of the reactionaries. Thus, the Political Declaration expressed the concern of the participants in the forum over the situation in Afghanistan and reiterated the resolution of the Delhi ministerial meeting (February 1981) on the political settlement of the problem. The conferees supported the constructive steps taken in this respect by the UN Secretary-General and called on all states to exercise restraint and to take such steps as would lead to the creation of "conditions conducive to stable and harmonious relations among the States of the region".[1]

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 31.

Giving an interview to newsmen after the conference, Indira Gandhi said that if a country felt endangered and turned to another state for military aid, this would be an exclusively internal affair of that country.[1]

Equally futile were attempts by some delegations, especially that of Singapore, to impose upon the conferees during debates on the "Kampuchean problem" a resolution in support of preserving a seat in the non-aligned movement for the representatives of the overthrown Pol Pot regime. What is more, the results of the debates showed that at the ministerial meeting preceding the seventh summit only 31 delegates out of the 97 attending the meeting spoke in favour of the Pol Pot clique.[2]

Debates resulted in the compromise decision to leave a vancant Kampuchean seat in the non-aligned movement. At the same time the conference resolution stressed: "The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed the right of the people of Kampuchea to determine their own destiny free from foreign interference, subversion and coercion and expressed the hope that through the process of negotiations and mutual understanding a climate conducive to exercise of that right would be created."[3]

As for the motives of the Singaporean delegation's vote in support of the Pol Pot clique, leading Indian expert K. Subrahmanyam explained its position in the following way: "Singapore is consistent

---

[1] *Times of India,* March 16, 1983.

[2] Ibid.

[3] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries,* p. 30.

in its policy towards Indochina. It supported Lon Nol against Sihanouk in 1971 and Pol Pot against Heng Samrin in 1979—both decisions in line with US policy. Singapore has its national and other interests to look after and these require Singapore to be seen to be on the American side."[1]

The Delhi conference paid much attention to international economic problems. The Delhi Message states that the main reasons behind inequality and exploitation are neocolonialism and imperialism.[2] The participants in the forum reiterated that the struggle to eradicate inequality and injustice in international economic relations and to establish a new international economic order was an inalienable part of the struggle waged by the developing nations for their political and social emancipation. Bitter criticism was levelled at the developed capitalist countries' attempts to sabotage UN resolutions on economic problems as well as at the policy of trade sanctions, blockade and other forms of coercion and blackmail used by the capitalist powers. Elaborating upon the theses of the Havana conference, especially that on holding global negotiations to establish just economic relations between the developing and the developed countries, the conferees specified their positions and adopted a special document—the Declaration on Collective Self-Reliance Among Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries.

With the aim of implementing the resolutions of

[1] *Times of India,* March 16, 1983.

[2] *Indian and Foreign Review,* Vol. 20, No. 11 Delhi, March 15-31, 1983, p. 21.

the Havana conference, the heads of state and government suggested that global talks be held on restructuring international economic relations.

How did the West respond to these calls by the non-aligned states?

In late May 1983, representatives of seven major capitalist states held a conference in Williamsburg, USA, to discuss acute economic problems faced by the capitalist world (inflation, economic recession, and growing unemployment). Without denying the fact that the protracted economic crisis in Western countries had caused serious damage to the developing countries, the participants in the conference, far from suggesting any specific measures to give effective aid to the developing countries, on the contrary, agreed to bring stronger pressure to bear on the young states by exploiting their financial debt (amounting to 600,000 million dollars in 1983).[1] The developed capitalist states refused to discuss the problem of lifting or at least lowering trade barriers that prevent the developing countries' goods from reaching Western markets and in fact declined the developing countries' proposal to hold global talks on the establishment of a just international economic order, ignoring all the demands related to these problems that the non-aligned states worked out at the Delhi conference.

On June 6, 1983, Belgrade saw the opening of the sixth session of UNCTAD, attended by representatives of 160 countries as well as many intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations.

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 6.

The work of the session demonstrated that the representatives of the US and other Western countries in fact failed to respond to the UN resolutions on economic problems, in particular the UN General Assembly resolutions adopted in 1979 on holding talks on key problems of the establishment of the new international economic order.

The Economic Declaration and the Programme of Immediate Measures in Areas of Critical Importance to Developing Countries, adopted by the seventh summit conference, outlined specific and constructive measures to improve the situation in the developing countries within the non-aligned movement.[1] Fidel Castro formulated the immediate aims of the non-aligned movement in the following way: "In the face of the nuclear tragedy threatening us, the drama of underdevelopment and exploitation and the economic and social crisis, there is no place for resignation or compromise. The only worthy choice is the fight."[2] This striving by the non-aligned countries is supported by the socialist countries and all the progressive forces in the world.

The results of the conference were highly acclaimed by the world peace-loving forces. At their conference held in March 1983, the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist states welcomed the resolutions of the conference.

---

[1] *Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries,* pp. 65-70.

[2] *New Times.* No. 12, Moscow, March 1983, p. 43.

CHAPTER III

THE UNITY OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT: WHAT AND HOW AFFECTS IT

§ 1. Non-Alignment, Neutrality and "Equidistance"

Some Western and even developing countries view the non-aligned movement as that of neutral countries. For this reason it is necessary to touch briefly upon the problem of neutrality, non-alignment and "equidistance".

So-called "positive neutralism" (neutrality) was the term many used initially to describe the foreign policy pursued by independent India. Nehru, however, described it as a policy of non-alignment with the military-political blocs of states, a policy of active opposition to the young states being drawn into military-political groupings, and as a struggle for international peace, security and national and economic independence. The policy of non-alignment is called upon to give independence to a state through its refusal to enter military groupings and presupposes an active effort to put into life the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems and to attain freedom and independence.[1]

[1] See, for example, *The Non-Aligned Movement in Documents and Resolutions,* Moscow, 1979, p. 18 (in Russian).

Moreover, neutrality rests on the policy of keeping away from wars and in peaceful time on that of refusing to take part in military blocs. Neutrality is underpinned by international norms recorded, as a rule, in conventions and is pursued, for example, by countries, such as Austria, Sweden and Switzerland.

The non-aligned movement is a policy of states aiming to make a constructive contribution to improving the international situation and to create external conditions most favourable for strengthening and protecting the national sovereignty they gained and for their speedy economic development.

In the 1960s, the non-aligned movement functioned as an organisation only during its summit conferences and preparation periods immediately preceding them, while in the 1970s, especially after the establishment of the Coordinating Bureau and their unofficial permanent headquarters in New York, the non-aligned states began to hold relatively regular meetings of their foreign ministers or permanent representatives on the eve of UN General Assembly sessions in order to coordinate their positions and work out draft resolutions on the part of the non-aligned movement.

In its resolutions or declarations the non-aligned movement outlines in clear-cut way its political trend, namely, anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-neocolonialism, struggle against apartheid and racism, and work to preserve international peace.

At the same time there are certain similarities between the policy of neutrality and that of non-alignment. First, neutral and non-aligned states are

interested in maintaining international peace and ending the arms race. Second, the two groups of states stay outside military blocs and have given commitments not to join any of them.

Neutral states in many respects support the programmes of the non-aligned countries and participate in their summit conferences as guests.

The evolution of the young non-aligned states' foreign policy programmes was to a certain extent influenced in the early 1970s by the concepts, in accordance with which the world was divided into three groups of countries,[1] with one of them consisting of the US and the USSR ("the two superpowers"), the second the developed Western capitalist countries and Japan and the third all the developing Asian, African and Latin American countries. This concept can lead to an erroneous conclusion that the non-aligned states should adopt the same approach to the policies pursued by countries with entirely different social systems. This disregard for the class nature of states not only led to confusion in working out the fundamental documents of the non-aligned movement and sapped the anti-imperialist thrust of the young states' strug-

[1] Speaking at the Sixth Special UN General Assembly Session in April 1974, the Chinese Representative said: "The United States and the Soviet Union make up the First World. The developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America and other regions make up the Third World. The developed countries between the two make up the Second World." (*China and the Three Worlds. A Foreign Policy Reader*. Edited by King C. Chen, London, Dublin, Lagos, New York, Singapore, Tokyo, 1979, p. 86.)

gle but also created certain difficulties in ensuring united action by all the peace-loving forces of our day against the forces of war and reaction.

In the past few years the non-aligned movement has repeatedly debated the problem of "equidistance" from the blocs of states and the "non-bloc" nature of the movement. The problem was especially widely debated during the preparations for, and the holding of, the Havana conference.

Let it be recalled that already at the Algiers conference (1973) Fidel Castro told the advocates of "equidistance" that for Cuba the world was divided into the capitalist and socialist countries, into imperialist and colonised countries, into reactionary and progressive countries, while the governments into those supporting imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism and those opposing imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism. He drew attention to the fact that such an approach was pivotal for Cuba in deciding the problem of alliance or non-alignment. Speaking at the opening of the Havana conference in September 1979, he said: "What charges can be brought against Cuba? That it is a socialist country? Yes, it is a socialist country, but we don't impose our ideology or our system on anyone, either inside or outside the movement... That we maintain fraternal relations with the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community? Yes, we are friends of the Soviet Union. We are very grateful to the Soviet people, because their generous cooperation helped us to survive and overcome some very difficult and decisive periods in our people's life, when we were even in danger

of being wiped out. No people has the right to be ungrateful."[1]

In his speech made on March 22, 1949, Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out: "When I say that we should not align ourselves with any power blocs obviously it does not mean that we should not be closer in our relations with some countries than with others. That depends on entirely different factors, chiefly economic, political, agricultural and many other factors.... While remaining quite apart from Power blocs, we are in a far better position to cast our weight at the right moment in favour of peace, and meanwhile our relations can become as close as possible in the economic or other domains with such countries with whom we can easily develop them."[2]

Finally, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, who was the movement chairman at the seventh summit conference, in her inaugural address said that non-alignment was "not vague, not negative, not neutral". Keeping away from military alliances, "we have sought and continue to seek friendship with all, except governments which are racist or threaten the hard-earned freedom of others".[3]

§ 2. Problems of Stronger Unity

As the ranks of the non-aligned movement broadened, the range of socio-political orientations of its

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment,* p. 477.

[2] *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches. September 1946-May 1949,* Vol. One, pp. 263, 264.

[3] *Indian and Foreign Review,* Vol. 20, No. 11, March 15-31, 1983, p. 5.

participants also grew to include states with monarchic regimes and feudal systems, capitalist countries, and those with multistructural economies, countries of socialist orientation and socialist states.

In the 1960s, the influence of the factor of social orientation of the young states was less noticeable in the non-aligned movement, because at that time problems of winning and strengthening their political independence were given priority attention. When political independence was attained and economic development problems were gaining in precedence, the relationship between the national and social aspects of the liberation struggle changed markedly and class differences sharpened.

The motley political and economic orientation of the members of the non-aligned movement accompanied by its further differentiation due to the uneven development and other causes objectively leads to certain disagreements in foreign policy and different views on some international problems. These different views become evident, for example, when attention is focussed on economic development problems: on the one hand, the non-aligned states, like all the developing countries, are equally interested in overcoming their economic backwardness and restructuring unequal international economic relations but, on the other hand, their rulers tackle differently specific economic problems and are not equally capable of opposing imperialism, while some of them are even inclined to come to a compromise with imperialist powers and monopolies.

It is for these reasons that the basic principles of the policy and aims of the non-aligned movement

recorded in the final documents of its summit meetings are sometimes interpreted differently by members of different groups of countries. This difference of interpretation is largely due to the different socio-political orientation of the movement members and their uneven political and economic development, all of which are to be considered in detail later on. It has already been mentioned that all the documents are adopted by conferences provided they are approved by consensus. In case of disagreement with any decision every participant has the right to reserve his point of view on the issue and to expound it in written form. There were, for instance, 17 reservations recorded at the Havana Conference. Thus, 16 countries refused to support the resolution expressing solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Puerto Rico and Belize for their independence. In connection with this impressive number of reservations the sixth conference passed a special resolution (Decision Regarding Methods of Strengthening Unity, Solidarity and Cooperation among Non-Aligned Countries, Section III, Item 1) which recommended that "reservations should be avoided as far as possible because they tend to weaken the consensus". The method itself is interpreted in the following way: "Consensus. . .It presupposes understanding of, and respect for, different points of view including disagreement and implies mutual accommodation on the basis of which agreement can emerge by a sincere process of adjustment among member nations in the true spirit of Non-Alignment. Consensus is both a process and a final compromise formula, shaped by prior consultations, discussions,

and negotiations into a generally agreed position."[1]

More than 20 years have passed since the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries. In the early 1960s, these states were primarily concerned with not being involved into military-political groupings and with upholding in this way their political independence. In the 1970s, the changed international situation, the growing influence and might of the socialist countries and the general recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence brought about quantitative and qualitative changes in the movement. At present it actively participates in opposing imperialism, neocolonialism and Zionism and in working against the threat of a world war and for the establishment of new international economic relations.

The UN General Assembly can pass no resolution on global problems of our day without it being approved by the non-aligned countries. The latter coordinate their activities at the UN and other international organisations to see resolutions passed by their conferences put into effect.

It should be pointed out, however, that the mid-1970s saw a marked tendency towards differentiation among the developing countries. For example, there emerged a group of countries with higher rates of growth of national income and investment and in some cases with higher labour productivity. Another group of states emerged with an extremely low per capita income, minimal investment growth and a weak industrial sector.

---

[1] *Two Decades of Non-Alignment*, pp. 473-474.

Economic differentiation among the newly-free countries was heightened considerably under the impact of structural crises in the world capitalist economy: the energy crisis led to the appearance of a group of rich oil-extracting states, some developing countries went through stepped-up industrialisation and saw incipient economic growth and higher per capita income.

Uneven economic and political development preconditioned the appearance in some developing non-aligned countries of the strongholds of imperialism, which breed seats of tensions both on a regional and global scale. These countries were ever more deeply involved not only in the world capitalist economy but also in the structure of imperialist policy. At the same time there appeared signs of growing domestic instability in these countries, as exemplified by the Shah regime in Iran and the Sadat regime in Egypt.

All these factors were responsible for contradictions in the non-aligned movement and the developing world as a whole. The majority of countries developing along capitalist lines were characterised by growing contradictions between, on the one hand, the social groups advocating development along capitalist lines, and, on the other, those coming out against all forms of exploitation. New social differences in some of these countries were often caused by the expansion of the capitalist sector, which started to subordinate other economic sectors. Furthermore, these states, objectively interested in overcoming their economic backwardness, and, consequently, in restructuring unequal inter-

national economic relations, had in power different groupings, which employed different approaches to grappling with economic problems and which differed in the degree to which they were capable of opposing the old international economic order, with some of them quite willing to make a compromise with imperialism.

When analysing the factors adversely influencing the unity and the consistently anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist tendencies of the non-aligned movement, it is necessary, first, to take into account that many emergent states, after attaining political independence, remain in many respects dependent economically on their former mother countries, which retain their positions in key economic sectors. For this reason their home and foreign policies are at times largely determined by the former mother countries. In some cases the position of certain developing countries is completely identical with that of Western powers. It goes without saying that this identity of views is often attained under pressure from former mother countries and infringes upon the interests of those emergent states.

Second, uneven development and the resultant growing political and economic heterogeneity of the non-aligned countries lead to contradictions in choosing the direction of joint action, in determining the principles of non-alignment and in assessing one international event or another. This differentiation results in the emergence within the movement of groups of forces reflecting the existing differences of views on politics and the goals of non-alignment.

Different approaches—revolutionary, reformist and

utopian—to the solution of problems facing the developing countries clash within the movement, which, beyond doubt, can hardly facilitate the working out of optimal solutions and saps the general struggle for the establishment of equal international economic relations.

The conception of "poor and rich nations" (North-South) artfully propagandised by the advocates of neocolonialism in no way promotes the cohesion of the non-aligned countries, nor makes their struggle purposeful. Speaking at the forums of the non-aligned countries or the Group of 77, at UN General Assembly sessions or specialised UN bodies, some representatives of the non-aligned states express towards the Soviet Union grievances and demands similar to those they have against imperialist powers, their former mother countries, ignoring the fact that the Soviet Union is in no way responsible for the colonial exploitation of backward countries. It has consistently been advocating the restructuring of international economic relations on an equitable basis, diverse cooperation with the developing countries and the cardinal solution of the problem of using part of the money released as a result of disarmament to help the developing countries.

The desire of certain conservative forces within the non-aligned movement to make a compromise with imperialism in the field of economic relations inevitably leads to political compromises. These forces are trying to impose upon the non-aligned countries decisions that can transform and even emasculate the anti-imperialist thrust of the movement principles and it is due to their efforts that resolu-

tions are sometimes adopted that make no distinction between the allies and the enemies of the non-aligned movement. It is characteristic in this respect that attempts are being made to equate the goals and actions of the aggressive NATO bloc with those of the defensive Warsaw Treaty Organisation and to confuse the concept of "blocs" with that of "socio-economic system", as a result of which some representatives of the movement come up with the thesis of the non-aligned countries' "equidistance".

Another negative factor affecting the unity of the non-aligned movement is growing differences among the countries with similar socio-political orientation in their approach to specific problems of our day. For example, there are difficulties in relations between Latin American and Caribbean countries, on the one hand, and Afro-Asian states, on the other, on some economic issues: Latin American countries, with their relatively higher economic development level, are against granting privileges in trade and economic relations to the least developed Asian and African countries. At the Afro-Arab conference in Cairo in March 1977, the oil-extracting countries promised to render aid to the African states but failed to answer a similar request by Latin American states. Economic relations between a small group of developing countries exporting industrial products and states exporting raw materials are also far from being smooth: countries exporting industrial products show insufficient interest in translating into life suggestions made by the exporters of raw materials interested in rising prices for them.

These differences among the non-aligned coun-

tries can also be observed at the UN. For example, initially the group of African countries held divergent views on the internationalist aid given by Cuba to Angola. Some members of the non-aligned movement adopted a hostile stand towards the peoples of Kampuchea and democratic Afghanistan.

Fairly acute contradictions among non-aligned states are at times observed in regional organisations, for instance, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). Founded in 1963, it promotes the struggle for the final elimination of colonialism, has raised the prestige of African countries in international affairs, and sizably contributed to the development of political, economic and cultural cooperation among them. However, it failed to make effective decisions on burning problems, such as the dispute between Somalia and Ethiopia, the question of Western Sahara, and the armed conflict in Chad.

The unity of the non-aligned movement is largely weakened by all sorts of political, economic and ideological differences, which exist among its members and sometimes even lead to direct armed clashes between them. These conflicts are largely caused by former colonial policies of Western powers which deliberately cultivated and maintained ethnic, religious, social and economic differences. Since the end of the Second World War more than 120 armed clashes have taken place in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Conflict situations have undermined the unity of the developing countries and aggravated the unstable situation in different regions, triggering the arms race in the developing world.

Analysis shows that most of the armed conflicts

had to do with the territorial borders of states. These borders were known to have been established by mother countries arbitrarily without any account for geographical, ethnographic or other factors. This is the reason behind many conflicts between sovereign states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Armed conflicts can also be caused simultaneously by a number of territorial, economic and religious differences (as exemplified by the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran).

The non-aligned movement is also weakened by the inconsistency displayed by representatives of some countries at non-aligned forums and other international meetings, including UN General Assembly sessions.

For example, while highly appreciating the role of the non-aligned movement in the preparation and passing of resolutions condemning Israel's aggressive course and Zionism as a form of racism, it should be mentioned that at the 35th UN General Assembly Session (1980) 35 states, among them the Central African Republic, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi and some Latin American countries, voted against the resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racism, and those who abstained from voting included Zaire, Kenya, Togo, the Upper Volta, the Philippines, Singapore and some other states.

The Havana summit unanimously (except for Egypt) passed a Political Declaration (Art. 108) condemning the Camp David agreements and the Treaty between Egypt and Israel. But when the 34th UN General Assembly Session voted on a resolution

on the Palestine problem, in which the Camp David accords were recognised nill and void (resolution 34/65 of November 29, 1979) Togo and Zaire voted against, apart from Egypt, while the Ivory Coast, Cameroon, Malawi, Singapore and some other countries abstained from voting.

It is likewise impossible to overlook the fact that many specific decisions made by the non-aligned states at their summit meetings repeatedly figure in successive documents without being implemented. Among them, for instance, are decisions on applying political and economic sanctions against Israel, blockading South Africa and severing diplomatic relations with it, implementing the UN Declaration on the Indian Ocean and on Namibia. It should be pointed out that this recurrence of certain resolutions speaks of the continued resistance of imperialism to the vital demands of the non-aligned and other developing states rather than of the movement's inconsistency.

Last but not least, mention should be made of growing expenditures on national armament, another phenomenon negatively affecting the unity of both non-aligned and developing countries in general. It has a baneful effect on the situation of the developing countries, which are short of material and financial resources so necessary to them to strengthen national independence and to ensure social, economic and cultural progress. According to a report made by government experts from 27 countries, the developing countries' share in world military expenditures rose from 3.3 per cent in 1955 to 7.2 per cent in 1970 and 16.1 per cent in 1980.

These expenditures grew especially rapidly in the Middle East countries (0.6 per cent in 1955 and 7.8 per cent in 1980) and in African countries (0.1 per cent in 1955 and 1.7 per cent in 1980); 25 developing states have used foreign licences to build munitions factories to produce infantry weapons and some other types of weapons. Prominent among these countries are Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan and Iran,[1] with Pakistan already producing surface-to-surface and air-to-air missiles. In expert opinion, the arms race is, as a rule, characteristic of those non-aligned countries (e.g., Pakistan and Saudi Arabia), which try to destabilise the situation in the countries carrying out progressive social transformations. It is noteworthy that the main threat to the independence of the countries rapidly arming themselves is posed precisely by those who supply them with weapons, experts, and counsellors, i.e., those who want to weaken the non-aligned movement, to distract the newly-emergent states from active anti-imperialist struggle and to pit them against other developing states.

Nevertheless the history of the non-aligned movement shows that it has retained its fundamental principles, is carrying on its active struggle against the forces encroaching upon the national political and economic interests of the newly-free countries and constitutes a mighty anti-imperialist force of our era. Furthermore, the late 1970s and the early 1980s made it even more obvious that the tasks of

[1] *UNESCO Courier,* April 1982, pp. 25, 35 (Russian edition).

the struggle for peace and nuclear disarmament are closely linked with the tasks of the national and social emancipation of the developing nations, the overwhelming majority of which are members of the non-aligned movement.

CHAPTER IV

ENEMIES AND ALLIES

§ 1. The US and the Non-Aligned Nations

After the Second World War one of the main goals of American foreign policy was to suppress the national liberation struggle and to preserve the system of dependence of Asian and African countries on capitalist powers. American imperialism "updated" that goal depending on a concrete situation and changes in the alignment of forces between the two opposite socio-political systems—imperialism and socialism. The constant element of the general strategy was the desire to keep the emergent states dependent on imperialism by using all sorts of pressure (political, economic and ideological), subversive activities and direct interference in their internal affairs. In the military-strategic field the attention was focussed on the conclusion of military pacts with the widest possible participation of newly-free states,[1] especially those bordering on the USSR and other socialist countries or located in close proximity to them. That was why whenever newly-free countries refused to join aggressive military-political

[1] H. D. Malaviya, *Non-Alignment Onward March*, Delhi, 1981, p. 17.

blocs, imperialism became alarmed and hostile, resorting to all forms of pressure, threats and blackmail towards them. In the early 1950s imperialist powers put pressure to bear on India, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia, that is to say, the pioneers and active organisers of the non-aligned movement, who prepared and successfully conducted the Bandung Conference and then the first (Belgrade) conference.

In the 1950s, during the cold war unleashed by the US and Western countries against the USSR and other socialist states, some newly-free states found themselves drawn into the sphere of imperialist influence, which greatly jeopardized the security and sovereignty of other developing countries. The ideological indoctrination of the leaders of those newly-free states was largely based on the thesis formulated by the then US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to the effect that the policy of non-alignment was insolvent and unpromising. Later on he declared the concept of non-alignment outmoded and even amoral and short-sighted, with the exception of some of its principles.

As the non-aligned movement developed and its ranks grew, along with its prestige and influence on international affairs, the US realised that its former tactics of overt pressure to bear on the developing countries was unpromising. In the early 1960s, it renounced patently hostile pronouncements with respect to the non-aligned movement and used a different tactics. Already in the late 1950s, different government and private research bodies in the US undertook an in-depth study of the problems of pre-

serving the positions of capitalism in Asian and African countries and worked out measures capable of, to quote former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, resisting "the force of attraction" and the pressure of communism on these countries. In his policy statement of 1962 President Kennedy spoke about the need to gain "new frontiers" and to revise some old-fashioned ideas of the world.

Under the new circumstances the imperialist powers could no longer hope to see the "policy from strength" succeed which, however, is not to say that imperialism renounced its former goals. Its "updated" course was based on the idea of directing the newly-free countries' socio-economic development along capitalist lines. As before, the USA intended to use the potential and means of other capitalist powers to preserve and strengthen as far as possible the dependence of the emergent states on these powers and, besides, re-distribute the spheres of influence, consolidating the US positions at the expense of former colonial powers. It was envisioned to give more active support to and to set up reactionary dictatorial regimes in developing countries that would pursue pro-American policy. The US modified its attitude towards the non-alignment policy: Chester Bowles, Undersecretary of State, said in April 1961 that the USA would "respect" the neutrality of those countries that had opted for the policy of non-alignment and help them build stable and strong societies capable of maintaining independence. In 1961, the so-called Development Assistance Committee was founded by 20 Western capitalist countries, who wanted to use the organisation in

the changed circumstances to maintain and enhance as far as possible the newly-free states' dependence on the industrially developed capitalist countries and to pursue the neocolonialist policy in more covert forms.

These steps were aimed at camouflaging the true goals of imperialism. It was precisely the 1960s that saw the US growing pressure to bear on the developing countries with the help of all sorts of means capable to disrupt the policy of non-alignment from within, to emasculate its anti-imperialist content and to weaken the links between the non-aligned states and the socialist countries.

Imperialism began paying special attention to the ideological struggle against socialism, stepping up its propaganda of the "advantages" of the capitalist world. Emphasis was placed on the thesis of the "civilising" mission of colonialism, the need and expediency of planting and developing capitalism in the newly-free countries for the sake of their "accelerated economic growth".

It should be pointed out that the US often replaced these methods of neocolonialism with direct military aggression, which showed that American strategy towards the developing countries involved terrorist activities, destabilisation of progressive regimes in these countries and disruption of the non-aligned movement. In August 1964, the US attacked the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and frequently used arms against Cambodia. It rendered vast aid to Portugal in suppressing the national liberation movements in its African colonies. April 1965 saw the US armed aggression against the Do-

minican Republic. In mid-1966, the US administration declared the "Johnson's Asia Doctrine", the true purpose of which was to suppress the national liberation movements in Asia. The CIA began increasingly interfering in the developing states' domestic affairs.

American strategists wanted the Vietnam war to teach the emergent states a lesson, impressing upon them that they had nothing else to do but to seek US patronage and to follow its imperialist policy. The vast military and economic aid given by the US failed to help the reactionary puppet regime retain power in Saigon. The Vietnam war showed that, supported by the broad mass of the people and by the comprehensive aid of socialist countries, the progressive forces were capable of emerging victorious in the struggle for their freedom and independence, even if they were opposed by US imperialism.

The strategy of neocolonialism aiming, among other things, at sapping the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist content of the non-aligned movement, centred as before largely on economic aspects. Aware of the futility of openly opposing the non-aligned countries' striving towards economic independence, the neocolonialists began looking for round-about ways of attaining their main goal—to perpetuate these countries as an appendix to the developed capitalist states.

For example, American economic aid to Egypt was openly aimed at making that country dependent on the US; in February 1963, in response to the decision by the Ceylon government to national-

ise the property of American Caltex and Esso oil concerns and also that of the British-Dutch Shell Corporation on its territory, the US presented it with an ultimatum to pay indemnities to American companies. It is common knowledge that some developing countries managed to nationalise the property of Western monopolies on their territory without any compensation, arguing that in the course of their "activities" the latter had made enormous profits by ruthlessly exploiting the local labour and natural resources.

In the late 1960s, when it became clear that the US was to suffer defeat in Vietnam and in the conditions of a changed alignment of forces in the world, the US administration was forced to revise all aspects of its foreign policy, including relations with the socialist countries, above all with the Soviet Union, to reconsider the terms of "partnership" with West European countries and Japan and to devise new forms of relations with the non-aligned states. In a bid to maintain and consolidate the positions of American imperialism in the developing countries, the US administration, headed at that time by Richard Nixon, declared for purely propaganda purposes its determination to "avoid involving the US into world conflicts". This "new approach" to the developing countries found clear-cut expression in the so-called Nixon Doctrine, which hypocritically proclaimed the principle of "partnership" and that of "self-reliance" as underlying American foreign policy.[1]

[1] *US Foreign Policy for the 1970s. Building for Peace. A Report to the Congress by Richard Nixon, President of*

"Partnership" was interpreted above all as a system of measures to strengthen economic, political and military pressure to bear on the developing countries to make them pursue pro-American policy, relying on their own forces and means.

According to the Nixon Doctrine, the American tactic of the period did not envision American withdrawal from those regions. The US intended to change the balance of world forces in their favour, particularly with the help of the regimes dependent on it politically and especially economically, and by "tying" developing countries to imperialist powers. This tactic influenced some of the non-aligned countries, and the positions they adopted provided a graphic illustration of attempts to sap the anti-imperialist nature of resolutions passed by the non-aligned forums.

In the late 1970s, the situation in the world worsened dramatically: US military spending reached record figures, while the US administration was bent on seeking military superiority over the socialist community and trying to justify the possibility of conducting a "limited", "protracted" and other types of nuclear war. The American strategy in international affairs became characterised by a sharp toughening of its policy towards the developing countries and by its stepped up activities to create tensions and conflicts among the developing countries. The destabilisation of regimes Washington found undesirable, extended military American presence far beyond its borders, the formation and use

the United States, February 25, 1971, Washington, 1971, pp. 5, 6.

of the American Rapid Deployment Force in the developing countries, and the building and expansion of military bases there are but a few practical actions that seriously jeopardize the non-aligned and, for that matter, all other countries of the world.

The US has launched an offensive against the developing countries in general and the non-aligned states in particular. In the political field intensive use is being made of the tactic of whipping up regional and bilateral conflicts with the aim of intruding in the conflict areas and building up its military presence there, suppressing the local national liberation movement and undermining progressive social and economic transformations. The non-aligned countries are being drawn into the arms race, which is an unbearable burden for their budgets and, besides, breeds an atmosphere of suspicion among their neighbours who are eventually drawn into the arms race and inevitably land themselves in the snares of economic and, consequently, political dependence on the arms producers—Western imperialist states, first and foremost the US.

The US expands the network of its military-strategic installations in different regions of the world and wrings out of the governments of some non-aligned countries (Somalia, Oman, Morocco, Egypt and Kenya) their consent to the American armed forces' using their military bases.

Another militarist action by American imperialism was the foundation, on January 1, 1983, of the so-called Central Command (CENTCOM), with its sphere of operation covering 19 non-

aligned states in Africa and Asia, a considerable part of the Indian Ocean and also the Persian Gulf. It was made public that the Central Command has at its disposal the Rapid Deployment Force and military bases on Diego Garcia, in Oman, Somalia, Kenya and some other states. The forces under this command are ready to start military operations against the states in the region at any moment.

During preparations for, and the holding of, the sixth and seventh conferences American imperialism tried to use the conservative regimes in some non-aligned states to compromise the foreign policies pursued by Cuba, Vietnam and some other socialist countries—members of the non-aligned movement.

The Western powers were disappointed to see that the seventh conference, planned previously to be held in Baghdad, was not postponed indefinitely. Subsequently, in the course of preparations for the conference the imperialists tried to ensure that it got " bogged down" in debates on problems of secondary importance and in this way to undermine the movement from within and to detract from its anti-imperialist character.

In spite of imperialist machinations, the Havana and then Delhi conferences were a success and demonstrated the developing states' striving after stronger peace and the security of nations, the termination of the arms race and transition to disarmament, the restructuring of international economic relations on just and democratic principles and complete and comprehensive decolonisation.

The participants in the Delhi forum pointed out that only American patronage and support enabled

Israel to carry through its expansionist plans and perpetrate lawlessness and crimes against the Arab people. Sharp criticism was levelled at American support for the racist South African regime.

Representatives of Latin American states spoke at the Delhi summit about the threat of American military invasion in Central America. They cited indisputable facts of Washington's subversive activities against Cuba and Nicaragua and of impudent American interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador whose people are fighting against the reactionary dictatorship.

When considering economic relations between the non-aligned and Western countries, the conferees, as before, denounced even more resolutely the policy of trade sanctions, blockade and other forms of coercion and blackmail pursued by the capitalist powers as a means of political pressure and interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign states. The Delhi forum condemned the attempts by the West, first and foremost the US, to sabotage UN decisions on holding global talks on key problems of a new international economic order, including the problems of raw materials, energy sources, trade, economic development and finances.

Speaking at the Delhi conference, Fidel Castro pointed out that the threat of war, which already existed during the 1979 meeting of the non-aligned countries, started heightening intensively when President Reagan decided to seek military superiority for the US over the USSR and that for NATO over the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. In his opinion, the runaway arms race was directly

encroaching upon the security of the developing countries.

The conference paid much attention to the situation in the South of Africa. For example, Jose Eduardo Dos Santos, President of the People's Republic of Angola, said that some Western countries —members of the so-called contact group (the US, France, Britain, West Germany and Canada), instead of facilitating the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory, invaded by them way back in 1979, are trying to distract the international community from the solution of that problem by marking time during negotiations and through diplomatic manoeuvres and pressure. The US ties the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalist forces from Angola, though it is common knowledge that UN Security Council Resolution No. 435 on the elimination of the colonial regime in Namibia makes no mention of such a condition.

The attempt to "tie" the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban military units was denounced at many international forums, since the presence of Cuban military units (on the request of the legitimate Angolan government) in no way violates the corresponding provisions of the UN Charter nor the principles or purposes of that international organisation. The Political Declaration of the Delhi Conference stressed that the attempt to make the two things conditional was nothing but interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola. The non-aligned

countries recorded in their documents their demand for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory and their resolute condemnation of the acts of military, political and economic destabilisation made by the racist South African regime against Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and the Seychelles.

In response to the resolutions passed by the non-aligned states the South African regime committed in early 1984, with the connivance of the imperialist states, fresh acts of aggression against Angola by invading its territory for up to 300 kilometers. South Africa has elevated terrorism to the level of state policy and for a long time now has been waging, with American support, an undeclared war against People's Angola.

Turning back to the plenary meetings at the Delhi conference, mention should be made of the active role played by the delegation of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Ali Nasser Muhammad, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council and Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, said that the emergence of new seats of tensions was a direct result of the attempts by American imperialism to tip the balance of forces in its favour, to enslave independent countries and stamp out the national liberation movements, and to establish undivided imperialist rule in the world. He also demanded that the US Central Command (CENTCOM) should be eliminated.

Here is what the American administration

thought of the results of the Delhi summit. The declaration of the non-aligned movement is "in many respects an unbalanced and polemical" document, the US Department of State concluded and went on to state that "the unfair attacks on the United States ... undermined the declaration's credibility".[1] The sharply negative response by the US to the results of the seventh conference shows that the enemies of the non-aligned movement failed to split it, to undermine its loyalty to the fundamental principles or to lead the participants away from discussing the burning problems of our day. The Western mass media resorted to falsification, juggling with facts and bypassing in silence the information about the forum found undesirable by the imperialists. President Reagan's behaviour was without precedent. On the fourth day of the Delhi conference, when discussions centered on how to counteract the activities of imperialism and neocolonialism against the non-aligned countries, he hurled undisguised threats at the delegates who represented the Central American and Caribbean countries.

American reaction to the Delhi conference and its results forcefully demonstrated the Reagan administration's actual attitude to the developing states. India was subjected to tangible pressure on the part of the US, which refused to purchase some traditional Indian goods, textiles in particular, while the Asia Development Bank, in which the US financial oligarchy is quite influential, refused to give loans to India, and the American press published maps

[1] *Times of India,* March 16, 1983.

of Indian territory in which some regions (for instance, the state of Jammu and Kashmir) were shown as not belonging to that country. Following the Delhi conference, American imperialism nearly doubled its military aid to Pakistan, on whose territory military bases are being set up to coordinate the operation of the Rapid Deployment Force, a component of all units at the disposal of the CENTCOM. It is pertinent to point out that these actions by the US are but a fraction of Washington's strategy, in keeping with which vast areas of the world have been proclaimed by the Reagan administration an "American zone" or a "zone of vital American interests". The "operations" in Nicaragua, bloody crimes in Lebanon, support for the South African racists, militarisation of the Indian Ocean and the torpedoing of the resolutions of the non-aligned movement and the UN on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace are but a few results of that strategy. It is not the first time that the US resorts to the "big stick" policy. But today the danger lies in that as the latest resolutions of the non-aligned movement expressed it, this policy is being pursued in new historical circumstances when it is a matter of life and death not only for millions of people, but for humanity as a whole.

In the economic sphere, transnational corporations (TNC) whose rapacious, self-seeking activities bring colossal damage to the developing countries' economies, serve as powerful levers of imperialist pressure to bear on the non-aligned and the rest of the developing countries.

In the field of ideology, the US is trying to wreck the anti-colonialist tendencies of the non-aligned movement, its struggle for national independence and support for the national liberation movements. With glaring cynicism, the imperialist, primarily American, propaganda identifies the national liberation movements of our day and the struggle of the peoples for their freedom and independence with "international terrorism".

Nevertheless, President Reagan did not hesitate to declare cynically in his message to the Delhi conference that the US was true to the principles of non-alignment. In practice, however, the Reagan administration is stepping up its interference in the affairs of young non-aligned states by announcing various regions of the developing world to be "zones of American security" or "zones of vital American interests".

Speaking at the 38th UN General Assembly Session on September 26, 1983, President Reagan allowed himself a discourtesy towards the members of the non-aligned movement. The Indian *Statesman*, commenting on his statement, wrote that among other things, he called on the UN to "reassert" its moral authority and said that "pseudo non-alignment" (with such countries as India in mind) was not the way to go about it. He also declared that "pseudo non-alignment is no better than pseudo arms control" and that some "non-aligned nations ... contribute to polarization of the UN".[1]

Addressing the Conference on Confidence-Build-

[1] *The Statesman*, September 27, 1983.

ing Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe (Stockholm, January 17, 1984), Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko pointed to another important characteristic of American policy. "Is it possible to overlook the fact," he said, "that Washington has resorted to clandestine subversive activities and terrorism against other states? It has included all these criminal and dishonest methods into the arsenal of its official foreign policy methods. They are being used in practice against some countries, their statesmen, and their social system.... If the opinion of this conference is worth anything at all, we should state this in a clear-cut form and urge those who engage in that activity to stop it and observe the commonly recognised norms of conducting inter-state affairs."[1]

§ 2. The USSR and the Non-Aligned Movement

The anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist policy pursued by the non-aligned countries and their efforts to strengthen peace and international security have fostered greater cohesion of these countries in working towards stronger political and economic independence. Of paramount importance for the world community was the non-aligned countries' policy of principle against the racist regimes in the south of Africa and their imperialist patrons. The final documents of all the non-aligned conferences recorded their unanimous support for the peoples fighting for their national and social

[1] *Pravda,* January 19, 1984.

liberation and the condemnation of imperialist schemes in Africa.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries regard non-alignment as the policy of a large group of developing countries and the non-aligned movement as an influential force in the world arena and from the outset supported the movement's resolutions and initiatives in every possible way.

The Soviet Union and all the socialist community countries welcomed the foundation of the non-aligned movement and have always considered it a positive factor in the development of international relations. The socialist countries that are not members of the non-aligned movement build their relations with the non-aligned countries on the basis of equality, non-interference in the domestic affairs, mutual respect and with due account for their common goals—the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence and against imperialism and colonialism. The socialist countries invariably come out for stronger political and economic independence of the developing countries.

Soviet messages to the non-aligned conferences, from the Belgrade summit on, have spoken highly of the movement and wished it success in fighting for peace, national independence and freedom.

Western powers are trying to emasculate the anti-imperialist nature of the non-aligned movement and to undermine cooperation between the non-aligned and socialist countries. Exposing these activities, Fidel Castro said at the Algiers conference that all attempts to drive a wedge between the non-aligned and socialist countries were in fact of a counter-rev-

olutionary nature and played into the hands of the imperialist forces alone. Addressing the concluding sitting of the conference, the late Algerian President, Houari Boumediene, pointed out in his turn that the non-aligned movement relies on the socialist community.

The fourth conference adopted a declaration calling for stronger cooperation with the socialist states to oppose the imperialist forces. It also supported some of the Soviet peace initiatives, for example, to establish a collective security system. A separate resolution was also adopted on the national liberation movement denouncing the policy pursued by the NATO countries and reiterating the legitimate right of the oppressed nations to struggle for their independence with the help of arms.

Long before the non-aligned movement came into being, the young Soviet state consistently and resolutely defended the right of all nations to self-determination and a choice of independent development. Right after the socialist revolution triumphed in Russia in 1917, the Soviet Government's earliest measures with respect to the countries of the Orient were to make public and annul secret inter-imperialist agreements, to which the tsarist government had been party, to break fettering treaties which had been imposed by tsarism upon China, Turkey and Iran, to transfer concessions to Iran and to annul its debts. The Soviet delegation at the Genoa Conference in 1922 proposed to restructure international economic relations on the basis of respect for sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and mutual benefit.

The Soviet Union has always considered it its internationalist duty to support the liberation movements of Asian, African and Latin American nations and welcomes the growing role that non-aligned states are playing in international affairs.

Diverse aid given by world socialism to the national liberation movement, which subsequently gave birth to the non-aligned movement, became especially manifest in the post-war period. In February 1946, the Soviet Union—the only Great Power to do so—supported the appeal by Syria and Lebanon, would-be members of the non-aligned movement, for the withdrawal of British and French troops from their territories. In 1947, it backed the demand by Egypt that British troops should pull out of it. In early 1946, the USSR raised at the UN Security Council the question of Britain's stopping military operations in Indonesia; in 1947 and 1948, it again spoke out at the UN in defence of the young Indonesian Republic and against Dutch aggression, economic blockade and political isolation. In November 1956, at the heat of the military intervention by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, the Soviet Union took a decisive step by demanding that the aggression be immediately stopped and announcing its firm determination to use force in its turn, if need be, to defend the victim of that aggression.

The economic, political and military potential of the USSR and other socialist countries forced the imperialist states to make concessions to the young developing nations and to refrain from direct acts of aggression and use of force. Consistently oppos-

ing imperialism's interference in the internal affairs of the young states and advocating the elimination of the colonial system, the Soviet Union worked to ensure the adoption of resolutions in support of the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. For example, in 1960, the USSR brought to the consideration by the UN General Assembly a draft Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The latter envisaged:

a) The immediate granting to all the colonial countries, trust and other non-self-governing territories of complete independence and freedom to build their own national states, in keeping with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial regime and colonial administration in all its forms should be abolished completely so that the peoples inhabiting these territories should be granted a chance to determine their destiny and forms of government.

b) All strongholds of colonialism in the form of possessions or leased areas on other territories should be eliminated.

c) The governments of all countries are called upon to observe strictly and undeviatingly in their relations with other states the principles of the UN Charter and the Declaration on Equality and Respect for the Sovereign Rights and Territorial Integrity of All States Without Exception and to avoid all manifestations of colonialism, all exclusive rules or advantages for some states to the detriment of others.

The UN General Assembly adopted the corres-

ponding Declaration, which was formulated on the basis of Soviet proposals.[1]

The Soviet Union has always actively opposed imperialist aggression in the Middle East, rendering political, diplomatic and economic support to the movement members, such as Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and the Palestine Liberation Organisation. It proposed a concrete programme of easing tensions in the region, demanded that foreign troops be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan, and so on. It backed the Indonesian people in their struggle against the Dutch and American aggressors, consistently and actively upheld the independence of states, such as Zaire, Cyprus, and the Dominican Republic greatly aided the peoples of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, and successfully helped normalise and stabilise the political situation in South Asia in 1965-1966 (the Tashkent Agreement between India and Pakistan, January 1966). The USSR and other socialist countries actively supported the Nigerian government in its struggle to preserve the federal state against the separatists that proclaimed the establishment of the state of Biafra (1967-1969). The Soviet Union adopted an internationalist approach to the national liberation struggle and the right of peoples to self-determination when the Republic of Bangladesh proclaimed its independence (in 1971)

[1] Speaking in August 1975 at a Special Session of the UN Committee on Decolonisation devoted to the 15th anniversary of the Declaration, Kurt Waldheim, the then UN Secretary-General, said that this historic document had made a great contribution to the struggle for national liberation.

and afterwards. Of tremendous importance was and continues to be the support given by the Soviet Union and other socialist states to the People's Republic of Angola and Ethiopia defending their independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity against the encroachments by the forces of imperialism, racism and internal reaction.

In the 1970s, cooperation between the socialist and non-aligned countries was increasingly turning into a factor of peace and easing tensions in international relations. In our opinion, important documents designed to strengthen international security were adopted thanks to the activities by the non-aligned states at many international conferences and at the United Nations.

The protocols and resolutions of the UN General Assembly sessions and specialised UN agencies furnish a convincing proof of the invariable, consistent and principled position of the Soviet Union in defending the right of the non-aligned and all developing states to independence, non-interference in their affairs and social progress. Suffice it to recall the resolute efforts by the Soviet delegations at the Sixth (April 1974) and Seventh (September 1975) Special UN General Assembly sessions in support of the young states' right to the utilisation of their own natural resources. The Sixth Special UN General Assembly Session convened on the initiative of the developing states discussed problems of raw materials and economic development and also, in keeping with the resolutions of the fourth non-aligned summit conference in Algiers, the problem of restructuring international economic relations. Joint

efforts by the socialist countries and the young states resulted in the adoption of the well-known programme of New International Economic Order, which declared that all states had the inalienable right to use their own resources and, what is more important, the right to nationalise the property of foreign monopolies.

Guided by the Leninist foreign policy principles which envision all-round support for the peoples fighting for their national liberation, the Soviet Union, along with its constant political and diplomatic support, gives young states and national liberation movements vast economic aid without any strings of political, military or any other nature. In so doing it is not after any rights, including the right to profit from enterprises it has built or other projects. Economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and other socialist states, on the one hand, and developing countries, on the other, helps the latter above all to develop their industrial base and sectors most important for individual countries and to overcome their backwardness and dependence on imperialist states and their monopolies.

This cooperation between socialist countries and young states made the imperialists in some cases ease the terms of their "aid".

The following figures give an idea of the scale of economic cooperation between socialist and non-aligned states.

In 1955, the USSR and India signed an agreement on building with Soviet aid a major steel works in Bhilai with a capacity of one million tons of steel a year. During the same period agreements

on trade and economic cooperation were concluded with Burma, Egypt, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and some other countries; later on agreements were signed with Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka (Ceylon), Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali and others on Soviet economic and technical aid in implementing their economic development plans. By 1982, the USSR maintained economic and technical cooperation with the total of 70 Asian, African and Latin American states.

By the early 1980s the Soviet Union had helped build 1,700 industrial enterprises, electric power plants, hydropower complexes and other economic projects in newly-free states. These have a considerable role to play in their national economies. For example, the metallurgical enterprises built in India with Soviet aid account for 35 per cent of the entire steel output (19 million tons), 50 per cent of the country's oil output, 70 per cent of the turbines and 80 per cent of the mining equipment produced in the country. Soviet geologists found oil in Syria, and now profits from oil exports exceed 50 per cent of all currency receipts of the country. The Helwân Metallurgical Plant built in Egypt with Soviet aid accounts for 100 per cent of pig iron, 74 per cent of steel, 70 per cent of rolled goods, and 100 per cent of coke produced in the country. Enterprises built with Soviet aid in Guinea give 20 per cent of the overall output of bauxites in the country; similar enterprises built in Ethiopia give 100 per cent of the country's output of oil products and those built in Algeria account for 100 per cent of the national output of pig iron and mercury. The build-

ing and equipment of major complexes with the help of socialist states (for instance, giant steel works in Bhilai and Bokaro, India, and in Helwân, Egypt, as well as hydropower projects on the Nile and the Euphrates) forced the West to revise its "aid" strategy.

As industrial projects built with the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were put into operation, the public sector began taking shape in some of the non-aligned states, promoting their economic development and industrialisation.

With every passing year the socialist countries are giving ever wider aid to young states in training their national personnel for industry, agriculture, transport, health service, education and so on.

Of no small importance is cooperation between the Soviet Union and non-aligned countries in strengthening their defence potential to enable them to defend themselves from attempts of imperialist aggression. It is no secret that thanks to military technology and ammunition supplies (on the easiest terms), the aid given by Soviet military experts and the training of the national military personnel at military educational establishments in socialist countries, some non-aligned Asian, African and Latin American states were able to form or re-equip their armies and (relying on Soviet political and economic support) withstand direct acts of armed aggression by imperialist states. The re-equipment of the Indonesian army (1961-65), the Cuban army (1961) and those of Egypt and Syria (1968-1973) provide characteristic examples of Soviet aid in this field. The selfless military aid given by the Soviet Union

to Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia and Algeria illustrates the internationalist duty performed by the Soviet people to nations fighting for their national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity.

Active Soviet efforts to ensure peace and the security of all nations enjoy support among the non-aligned countries. They ensured the adoption by he UN of a number of resolutions on some burning problems, such as the strengthening of world peace and security, disarmament, the prevention of aggression, the curbing of the arms race, and the struggle against colonialism and racism. At the 34th UN General Assembly Session (1979) the developing countries backed the resolution "On the Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations" which had been proposed by the Soviet Union, and at the 35th UN General Assembly Session another Soviet proposal, the draft resolution "On Some Pressing Measures to Lessen the War Danger" also met with support by the majority of the non-aligned states.

In 1983, the Warsaw Treaty states proposed to the NATO members to conclude a Treaty on the Mutual Non-Use of Military Force and Maintenance of Relations of Peace in the interests of preserving universal peace and the security of nations, including the non-aligned countries. Thereupon the Soviet Union brought for the consideration by the 38th UN General Assembly session (1983) another important issue—"Freezing Nuclear Armaments"—and proposed that a declaration on "Condemning Nuclear War" be adopted. These Soviet proposals

were accepted by the world community. Finally, the USSR proposed that an agreement on the renunciation of the use of space in military purposes be concluded, and, in January 1984, the socialist countries passed to the NATO countries a draft agreement on the non-use of chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have actively been supporting the developing countries' proposals aiming at combatting colonialism, racism and neocolonialism and at strengthening security and stability on all the continents.

Active support for the developing states' struggle for the restructuring of international economic relations is another key element of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. "It is quite clear now," the 25th CPSU Congress pointed out, "that with the present correlation of world class forces, the liberated countries are quite able to resist imperialist diktat and achieve just—that is, equal—economic relations."[1] The Soviet Union is an active supporter of the developing countries' just demands for the radical transformation of existing unequal international economic relations and for an end to discriminating practices pursued by imperialist monopolies and transnational corporations towards the young states. It has already been mentioned earlier that the Soviet Union made proposals at the 31st UN General Assembly Session (1976), stating that "the nature of international

[1] *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU,* Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 16.

economic relations, which took shape against the backdrop of an entirely different alignment of world forces and which meets only the selfish interests of imperialist monopolies, now contradicts the vital interests of the vast majority of countries and the development of the general international situation."[1]

At the same time the socialist states criticise in a frank and businesslike manner those provisions of the programme of the New International Economic Order, which reflect attempts to detach the solution of foreign economic problems from profound socio-economic transformations in the developing countries and to meet the requirements of the developing countries alone. International economic relations should be restructured in the interests of all countries and nations rather than in the interests of some separate group of countries. It is necessary to put an end to discrimination and lawlessness on the part of imperialism both towards the developing and socialist states.

The so-called theories of "rich and poor countries" and of "North and South" ignore the differences existing between the socialist and capitalist states in order to justify the equal responsibility and, consequently, equal obligations to the non-aligned countries by both the imperialist states, which rapaciously exploited the colonial and dependent countries, and the socialist states, which have never had colonies and always built their relations with other countries on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in internal affairs. Unfortunately, the non-aligned

[1] *Pravda*, October 5, 1976.

movement in resolutions of its forums sometimes expresses support for the thesis of "equal demands".

The socialist states consider the restructuring of international economic relations as inseparably connected with the general improvement of the international situation, attaching prime importance to detente, the ending of the arms race and disarmament in the world.

Developed socialist countries and many non-aligned nations maintain relations of friendship and diverse cooperation. Developing countries, especially those of socialist orientation, show considerable interest in the historical experience of the USSR and other socialist community countries, as many problems the socialist countries had to tackle in building their states, developing their economies, national relations and cultures, and training the national personnel are now being tackled by the young Asian, African and Latin American states.

CONCLUSION

The non-aligned movement came into being in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism when young independent states galore emerged on the international scene, aspiring to develop freely and in peace. Lenin foresaw that the oppressed nations, which had formerly been mere "objects of international imperialist policy" would emerge "as independent participants, as makers of a new life" and on a par with other nations would take part in "deciding the destiny of the whole world".[1]

The emergent states saw in the non-aligned movement a chance to resist collectively the imperialist attempts to draw them into aggressive military-political blocs and alliances, a possibility to pursue independent policy, to work towards the restructuring of international economic relations on an equal and democratic basis and to struggle for peace and against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

From the outset the movement joined the ranks

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1974, pp. 159-160.

of the anti-imperialist front, which unites all the revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces of our day. It is also a component of the world revolutionary process—the national liberation movement. In their domestic policies an ever growing number of non-aligned leaders now proceed from the organic relationship between the struggle for social progress and opposition to imperialism.

The heterogeneous composition of the non-aligned movement, which incorporates states representing virtually the entire gamut of social structures existing in the world, accounts for the unending inner struggle of ideas, concepts, ideological and political trends, which essentially boils down to the problem of choosing bearings for the non-aligned movement and its political directions.

The imperialists and other reactionaries continue their attacks in a bid to split the non-aligned movement, to undermine it from within and to emasculate the anti-imperialist content of the policy of non-alignment. In this connection well-known Indian scholar Vijay Gupta wrote: "The Western moves are designed to minimize the anti-imperialist content of the non-aligned movement seeking to reduce it to ineffective neutrality. . . .Under the guise of these theories, the enemies of non-alignment wish to put the USSR and the US on an equal footing in regard to relationship with the developing countries on the question of national liberation, racialism, peace, disarmament, military bases, dumping of arms and nuclear war threats. The Western powers want to divert and neutralize the present non-aligned position on the creation and continuation of

the military blocs, setting up of a Rapid Deployment Force, establishment of military bases."[1]

Imperialism is now engaged in a large-scale offensive against the non-aligned countries. In the political field, the imperialist countries resort to the "divide and rule" policy, whipping up conflicts between individual countries and exploiting crisis situations to build up their military presence in the zone of the national liberation movement. In the economic field, imperialism uses transnational corporations as the main levers of its expansion and ruthlessly exploits the developing countries, seeking to retain them as unequal and dependent members of the world system of the capitalist economy. The imperialist powers still have a real possibility to bring pressure to bear on the non-aligned and the rest of the developing countries, at times making them yield. "Disobedient" governments are dealt with through plots, for which imperialism finances the reactionaries and subversive elements in independent states.

In the ideological field, imperialism is trying to breed among the non-aligned countries a negative attitude to the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and to persuade the movement members that world socialism and the national liberation movement have no common interests. With this aim in view officials in the West vigorously propagandise the concept of "equidistance" allegedly to be espoused by the non-aligned

---

[1] *India and Non-Alignment.* Edited by Vijay Gupta, New Delhi, February 1983, p. 7.

movement in its theoretical and practical activities.

Meanwhile "it is the Soviet Union and other socialist countries", Harkishan Singh Surjeet, Indian M. P., pointed out, "that have come to the help of the newly-independent countries whether it is the question of strengthening their sovereignty and resisting imperialist arms twisting or industrial and economic development". It would be a gross mistake for the non-aligned movement, he added, not to recognise this fact and to put the Soviet Union—the friend of the non-aligned movement—on the same footing with the US—the enemy of the movement.[1]

There is no doubt that the position of those who advocate further interaction between the non-aligned movement and the world of socialism is historically correct, because only alliance with the main anti-imperialist force of our day—the world socialist community—can enable the non-aligned countries to resist successfully imperialist diktat, acts of aggression, ideological and political subversion and to make fresh accomplishments in working towards the goals of the non-aligned movement.

The solution of all problems of world development is now determined by the victory of the democratic, revolutionary, socialist, anti-war, that is, all progressive forces over international reaction spearheaded by American imperialism. For this reason the role the non-aligned movement is going to play within this united anti-imperialist front will largely determine the actual possibilities for the non-

[1] Ibid., p. 39.

aligned countries to ensure their own independent and progressive development and to attain the programmatic goals of the movement. Its further success will directly depend on the unity of the non-aligned countries on the basis of their adherence to the fundamental principles and goals of non-alignment.

The forces of imperialism, first and foremost the US, are carrying on their subversive activities against the non-aligned movement, openly meddling in the affairs of the non-aligned countries, especially those consistently pursuing the course of progressive development.

It should be pointed out, however, that, despite growing imperialist pressure on the national liberation forces, they have scored visible success in the past few years. Their accomplishments would have been impossible without support by the progressive forces of the world or without the unity of action between socialist and non-aligned countries. The latter are not nor can be neutral in choosing between war and peace, between imperialism and anti-imperialism, between oppression and freedom. It is for this reason that they cannot but cooperate with other progressive and peace-loving forces. This cooperation has always had an objective basis, which is to expand in the future.

NOTES

The Afghan "problem". The anti-popular regime of H. Amin, who teamed up with the forces of reaction and imperialism, was deposed on December 27, 1979. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan set up a new government headed by Babrak Karmal, which proclaimed an extensive programme of national democratic, socio-economic and political transformations in the interests of the broad mass of the people. Facing the threat of a foreign intervention, Babrak Karmal's government asked the Soviet Union to help it defend its national sovereignty; the request was met in accordance with the Soviet-Afghan treaty of friendship, good-neighbourliness and cooperation. The imperialist and reactionary forces engaged in the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan launched a slanderous campaign against the alleged "Soviet interference in the Afghan affairs", distorting the character of Soviet aid, which fully complies with the UN Charter.—p. 64.

ANZUS, a military pact between Australia, New Zealand and the US, which was signed in San Francisco, USA, on September 1, 1951, and came into force on April 29, 1952. It forms part of the system of aggressive military blocs of Western powers directed against the USSR and other socialist states and against the liberation movement in South-East Asia.—p. 10.

ASEAN, the Association of South-East Asian Nations, a regional organisation consisting of Indonesia, Malaysia,

the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Brunei, was set up at a conference of the foreign ministers of these countries held in Bangkok on August 8, 1967. The major tasks declared by the association are to promote economic, social and cultural progress; to strengthen peace and regional stability; and to cooperate in developing research, education and technology, training the personnel, and so on.—p. 59.

The Asia Development Bank was set up in accordance with a corresponding agreement enforced in August 1966. This inter-governmental crediting institute designed to finance different development programmes in Asian countries is based in Manila (the Philippines) and is dominated by the US and Japan.—p. 105.

Bantustans are ghettos for blacks in South Africa. The fifth summit conference of the non-aligned countries passed a resolution on the non-recognition of the South African bantustans.—p. 51.

Belize. The Political Declaration of the sixth non-aligned summit (§§164-165) expressed full support for the inalienable right of the people of Belize to self-determination, independence and territorial integrity, condemned any pressure or threat with the aim of precluding the implementation of that right and backed the right of the Belize government to the conclusion of agreements it deems necessary to resist effectively that threat.—p.

CENTCOM, a regional American military command set up on January 1, 1983 to cover 19 states in South-West Asia and North Africa. In peacetime the commander is subordinate directly to the orders issued by the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff. The CENTCOM prepares plans for possible wartime operations, effects "military interaction" among the leaders of the countries in the given region and supervises military aid programmes there. It relies on a wide network of American military bases and installations in the region, particularly in Oman, Somalia, Kenya and Egypt. Diego Garcia is the main stronghold in the south and Israel plays the same role in the north. The new command is intended to be a watchdog, to support the regimes the US finds desirable

and to interfere actively in the domestic affairs of the sovereign states in the region.—p. 38.

CENTO, Central Treaty Organisation, a military-political grouping in the Middle East founded on the initiative of Britain and the US in 1955. After Iran and Pakistan withdrew from the organisation in 1979, the Turkish government proposed that the organisation should stop its operation, as it in fact no longer discharged any function.—p. 11.

The Chagos archipelago makes part of the state of Mauritius. One of the islands of the archipelago (the Diego Garcia atoll) was seized by its former mother country (Britain) in 1965 and then leased to the US, which built there one of its major naval and air bases in the Indian Ocean.—p. 70.

Chapultepec Act of 1945 was adopted at the Inter-American Conference on problems of war and peace in the castle of Chapultepec (Mexico) on March 6, 1945. The conference was attended by the US and all the Latin American countries with the exception of Argentina. The Act centers on mutual aid and inter-American solidarity. It was used by the US for setting up a military-political pact of American states under US hegemony.—p. 14.

Cold war, the term which has gained wide currency after the Second World War and denotes the policy of the reactionary and aggressive elements in the West towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and also peoples fighting for their national independence, peace, democracy and socialism.—p. 10.

Collusion among the US, Israel and the Sadat regime during their tripartite talks at Camp David on September 5-17, 1978, as a result of which two agreements—"The Framework of Peace in the Middle East" and "The Framework of Concluding a Peace Treaty Between Egypt and Israel"—were signed, in fact bringing to nought the possibility of a just settlement of the Middle East conflict. Both documents defy UN Security Council resolutions.—p. 54.

The contact group made up of the representatives of

the US, France, Britain, West Germany and Canada was set up in 1981 and sought to substitute different compromises with Pretoria's regime for the political settlement of the Namibian problem on the basis of Resolution 435 of the UN Security Council on granting independence to Namibia.—p. 103.

The dispute between Somalia and Ethiopia was provoked by Somalia's claims to Ogaden, part of Ethiopian territory, and resulted in Somalia's armed aggression against Ethiopia in July 1977.—p. 88.

Foreign invasion of developing countries. At the end of the Second World War British troops were stationed in Egypt (in the Suez Canal zone). In late September 1945, British troops occupied Indonesia, using Japanese soldiers, who had not yet laid down their arms, against the independent Indonesian state. There were British and French troops is Syria and Lebanon. The resolute support given by the Soviet Union to the demands made by the Syrian and the Lebanese government at the UN Security Council helped the Syrian and the Lebanese people to force French and British troops to withdraw from Syria in 1946 and from Lebanon in 1947.—p. 111.

The Genoa Conference of 1922 was attended by 29 independent states and 5 dominions of Great Britain (the US refused to take part in the conference) and dealt with economic and finance problems. The official aim of the conference was to find measures towards the "economic rehabilitation of Central and Eastern Europe". However, in fact the key issue of the conference was the problem of relations between the Soviet state and the capitalist world after the abortive attempts to overthrow the Soviet government through military intervention. Of paramount importance was the Soviet proposal on universal disarmament made at the first plenary session of the conference (April 10, 1922). Nevertheless, both the disarmament issue and the problems of settling mutual financial and economic claims were not resolved by the Genoa Conference through the fault of the capitalist states. —p. 110.

ICCEC, Intergovernmental Councial of Copper Export-

ing Countries, was set up in May 1968 in accordance with the convention worked out at the Copper Conference held in Lusaka (Zambia) in June 1967. The aims of the organisation were to coordinate measures to ensure a steady and dynamic growth of real income from copper export, to promote coordinated policy of the member-states on problems of copper production and marketing, to build up resources for the economic and social development of the copper-producing countries, and so on. Among its members are Chile, Indonesia, Mauritania, Peru, Zaire, and Zambia, and Australia and Papua-New Guinea are its associated members.—p. 47.

Israel's aggression against Lebanon. In June 1982 Israeli troops invaded Lebanese territory to impose upon that country a treaty that would split the Arab world and guarantee Israel and American imperialism a dominant position in the Middle East.—p. 68.

Korean War. On June 25, 1950, the South Korean regime unleashed military operations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In July 1950, the US interfered in the conflict and, besides it, some other countries joined in the intervention under the disguise of the UN forces. Supported by the USSR, China and other socialist countries, and also by the progressive forces throughout the world, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea rebuffed the aggressors and forced them to sign a ceasefire agreement on July 27, 1953.—p. 14.

Lon Nol led a coup d'etat in Cambodia in March 1970 and deposed Norodom Sihanouk. He himself was ousted by the armed forces of the Kampuchean National United Front in April 1975. *Heng Samrin,* chairman of the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea, chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, was subsequently elected General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and beginning with 1981 also chairman of the State Council of Kampuchea.—p. 73.

Namibia. In the spring of 1981 the US, with the consent of the other members of the so-called contact

group (Canada, France, Britain and West Germany), insisted that the problem of granting independence to Namibia should be tied to the withdrawal of a limited contingent of Cuban troops from Angola, whose legitimate government had invited them to defend the country from South African invaders. The presence of Cuban troops fully accords with the provisions of the UN Charter.—p. 68.

NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, a military and political alliance of 16 capitalist states of Europe and North America, was founded on US initiative in 1949 at the heat of the cold war.—p. 10.

Nigeria. In 1967-1969, Eastern Nigeria saw the emergence of a serious separatist movement for the establishment of an independent state—the Republic of Biafra—supported by the imperialist states. On January 12, 1970, the separatist armed forces capitulated.—p. 113.

The Nixon Doctrine, a policy of "lessening involvement" of the American armed forces directly in conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This policy envisioned, among other things, the using of the local reactionary forces (for example, Iran under the Shah) to stamp out the national liberation movement in the Middle East.—p. 99.

OPEC, the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries was founded on Venezuela's initiative in September 1960. According to its rules, only states considered to be "pure" exporters of oil, i.e., those producing more oil than they consume, can be its members. These include Algeria, Ecuador, Gabon, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kuweit, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. The rules define the aims of the organisation as "defence of the interests of the member-states both every one taken separately and all of them put together" from the arbitrary action of the international oil cartel and greater deductions for the petroleum producing countries. In the year of its existence the OPEC repeatedly raised oil prices.—p. 47.

The Organisation of African Unity, a regional interstate political organisation formed in May 1963 by decision of the Addis Ababa conference of heads of state and government of the independent African countries. The

OAU members pledged to coordinate their activities in different areas of inter-state relations, including foreign policy, economics, science and technology, defence and security, education, culture and health care. Elimination of the vestiges of colonialism on the continent and of racism in South Africa forms the core of OAU activities. At present 50 independent African countries are members of the OAU, that is to say, all the African states, except South Africa. —p. 38.

Panama. In September 1977, the US signed two treaties with Panama, recognising its sovereignty over the Panama Canal zone. The Americans, however, retained certain privileges, and it is not until 1999 that the Panamanian government is to come into full control of the Canal.—p. 68.

The Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel was concluded in Washington on March 26, 1979, on the basis of the agreement on "The Framework of Concluding a Peace Treaty Between Egypt and Israel".—p. 56.

The overthrow of the reactionary Pol Pot-Ieng Sari clique. This came to power in Kampuchea (Cambodia) on April 17, 1975, after the victory of the national patriotic forces over the pro-American regime of Lon Nol, and established a fascist dictatorship in the country and pursued the policy of mass terror. In early January 1979, the revolutionary patriotic forces guided by the United Front for National Salvation of Kampuchea and actively supported by the people ousted the Pol Pot-Ieng Sari regime. On January 11, 1979, Kampuchea was declared a People's Republic, and this victory of the Kampuchean people was welcomed by progressive minds all over the world. The new leadership took vigorous measures to normalise the life of Kampuchean society.—p. 59.

Rapid Deployment Force is formed of four types of American armed forces, including ground force, the marines, air force and the navy, trained both in conventional and nuclear warfare. The US military-political leadership created the Rapid Deployment Force to be moved to seats of tensions to protect "vital American interests" in any region of the globe. From the outset South-East

Asia (about 20 countries), which is of special interest to the US from the strategic and economic points of view, was declared the main region of operation of the Rapid Deployment Force. It was placed at the disposal of the newly formed Central Command (CENTCOM) and was used during American aggression against Lebanon and Grenada.—p. 70.

The Republic of Bangladesh was proclaimed on the territory of former Eastern Pakistan in 1971 as a result of the powerful movement for national independence and state sovereignty.—p. 113.

The Republic of Chad saw the installation of its government headed by Goukouni Ouedei (with Hissen Habré as defence minister) in August 1979. It failed to eliminate acute national, social and religious differences in the country, as a result of which a dramatic conflict emerged between its two warring groupings headed respectively by Goukouni and Habré. Zaire, France and the US came to interfere in the conflict.—p. 64.

SEATO, South-East Asia Treaty Organisation, a military-political alliance set up on American initiative. The treaty to found it was signed in September 1954 and came into force in February 1955. The organisation ceased to exist in June 1977.—p. 11.

Soviet foreign policy moves in the UN. In December 1974, the UN adopted the Declaration on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order and the Action Programme, which the non-aligned countries had proposed for consideration by the UN General Assembly and which had been supported by the USSR and other socialist countries. The Soviet Union actively backed the proposal by the participants in the fifth non-aligned summit (1976) that a special disarmament session be held. Such a session took place in June 1978. On Soviet initiative, the UN passed in 1979 the resolution "On the Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations", the problem that had been discussed repeatedly by the non-aligned nations and came to be reflected in a number of resolutions made by their summit conferences.—p. 118.

The Tashkent Agreement. In the autumn of 1965, relations between India and Pakistan worsened dramatically, which led to direct armed clashes between the two countries. Firmly convinced that peaceful and good-neighbourly relations were in the interests of the two nations concerned, the Soviet Union proposed its services in organising a meeting between the two states' leaders (Pakistani President M. Ayub Khan and Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri) on Soviet territory. The proposal was accepted and the meeting took place in Tashkent in early 1966, when the Tashkent Declaration was signed to lay the groundwork for solving disputes in relations between India and Pakistan.—p. 113.

Transnational corporations (TNC) are international monopolies, which are national as far as their capital is concerned and international as far as their activities are concerned. International monopoly business is dominated by 300 American transnational corporations. Their prosperity depends on their activity in the "recipient countries" rather than on their operations within the home countries. Their essence is manifest in their "global strategy" which has always aimed at profit and plunder. At present there is a marked trend towards their expansion in the developing countries and their stepped up activity as the main strike force of neocolonialism.—p. 49.

US invasion of Grenada took place in October 1983. The flagrant American aggression against the sovereign state evoked general condemnation by the world progressive forces. An extraordinary plenary session of the UN General Assembly convened for the immediate discussion of the situation on Grenada passed a resolution describing America's actions as a gross violation of international law and an encroachment on the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Grenada. The resolution was adopted by 108 votes to 9.—p. 68.

Western Sahara became a source of conflict between Mauritania, Morocco and Algeria in connection with the granting of independence to this former Spanish colony.—p. 64.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Vladimir Benevolensky, Cand. Sc. (Hist.), is Deputy Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences and an expert on the developing countries.

The present publication offers a popular historical survey of the non-aligned movement from its inception to our day. The author focuses on some major problems of and prospects for the non-aligned nations and gives an assessment of the accomplishments of the movement, relying on pertinent documents, declarations and resolutions. He also describes the Soviet and the American position with respect to the non-aligned movement, exposing those forces which seek to undermine its unity.